



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M-71109-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 22.12.2025

Minkal Babu @ Mikal Babu

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Sourabh Singla, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This first petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.12 dated 24.01.2025, registered for offence(s) under Section(s) 22(c) [Section 29 added later on] of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Siwan, District Kaithal.

2. As per the case set up by the prosecution, the FIR was registered on the basis of a secret information to the effect that one Partap, son of Preet Ram, was engaged in the business of selling intoxicant tablets and that, if apprehended, a recovery could be effected from him. Acting upon the said information, the said accused was apprehended and, upon his search, 145 strips comprising a total of 1,450 tablets of Tramadol were



recovered from his possession.

3. Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has been nominated as an accused solely on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the co-accused, Partap. He contends that no recovery of any contraband has been effected from the petitioner and that the only circumstance relied upon by the prosecution for arraying the petitioner as an accused is the alleged recovery of a sum of ₹1,500/-. He submits that there is no material whatsoever to establish that the said amount is proceeds of drug trade. He also contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 26.08.2025 and has clean criminal antecedents. He also points out that the investigation in the matter stands concluded and the charge has already been framed. Moreover, the prosecution evidence is yet to commence and the trial is likely to take a long time for to conclude.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects. She fairly concedes that out of total 17 prosecution witnesses none has been examined so far. The period of custody as well as clean antecedents of the petitioner is also not disputed.

5. Having heard the counsel appearing for the parties and considering the period of actual custody already undergone by the petitioner, his clean criminal antecedents, the nature of the role attributed to him and the present stage of the trial coupled with the fact that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is



211 CRM-M-71109-2025 (O&M)

ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

22.12.2025
Mangal Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No