



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-11246-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 24.03.2026

RAMESH CHANDER @ RAMU

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Vikramjeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amrit Pal Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab.

.....

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.161 dated 02.12.2025 registered under Sections 15, 29, 61, 85 of NDPS Act, at Police Station Chhajli, District Sangrur, Punjab.

2. Brief facts of the case of prosecution are that HC Jagdeep Singh with other police officials while on patrolling duty, on suspicion apprehended the petitioner, who was found in conscious possession of 40 kgs of poppy husk. Hence the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner has been roped into the present case solely due to the campaign



being carried out by the State of Punjab against the drug menace, as a result of which a large number of individuals are being implicated even in cases involving small recoveries. He further submits that the petitioner has no connection whatsoever with the recovered contraband, and even if the prosecution version is assumed to be true, the recovery allegedly effected from the petitioner falls within the category of non-commercial quantity. He further submits that the petitioner has clean antecedents and is not involved in any other criminal case. It is also submitted that the petitioner has been in custody for the last nearly three months, and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time. Therefore, he prays that the present petition be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Amrit Pal Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and has filed custody certificate and status report in the matter, which are taken on record. He submits that the petitioner was apprehended and was found in conscious possession of 40 kilograms of poppy husk, which is a substantial recovery. He further submits that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and attract the rigours of the NDPS Act. It is contended that the recovery cannot be termed as planted at this stage, and the veracity of such a defence can only be examined during trial. Learned State counsel further submits that in his disclosure statement he has admitted that the recovered contraband was to be supplied to one Rinku, hence, considering the gravity of the offence and the manner of recovery, there exists a strong prima facie case against the petitioner. It is

also argued that if released on bail, the petitioner may abscond. Therefore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations and the larger public interest, he prays for dismissal of the present petition.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record. In the present case, the petitioner was apprehended and found in conscious possession of 40 kilograms of poppy husk, which constitutes a substantial recovery. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. At this stage, the plea of false implication cannot be gone into in detail, as the same would be a matter of trial. The disclosure statement of the petitioner further indicates his involvement in the supply chain of contraband substances. This Court cannot lose sight of the fact that the country has been grappling with a grave and pervasive drug menace, which has had devastating effects on the social fabric, particularly the youth. Offences under the NDPS Act are, therefore, required to be dealt with a firm hand. The petitioner is seeking bail mainly on the ground of his custody. Perusal of custody certificate reveals that the custody of petitioner in the present FIR is barely three months.

7. Consequently, keeping in view the recovery effected from the petitioner, the gravity of the offence, the custody period undergone by him, and the larger societal interest, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of bail. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

24.03.2026

Puneet....

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No