



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(244)

CRM-M-11310-2026(O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 22.04.2026

Vansh Kwatra

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Gurpreet Singh Thind, Advocate,
and Mr. Lovepreet Handa, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 BNSS of 2023, seeking grant of concession of **regular bail**, to the petitioner in case FIR No.316 dated 26.11.2025, under Section 22(b), 27(a) and 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 and Section 223 of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Lambi, District Shri Muktsar Sahib.

3. As per the allegations of present FIR, on 26.11.2025, recovery of 10 ETIJAP-0.5 Tablets Etizolam Tablets IP 0.5 mg, 10 ETIJAP-0.25 Tablets Etizolam Tablets IP 0.25 mg, 80 PREGSCO-300 Pregabalin Capsules IP 300 mg and Rs. 7,26,000/- (drug money) was effected from co-accused Manish Kumar and Sahil Kumar. Petitioner/accused (Vansh Kwatra) was nominated in present case under Section 29 of NDPS Act with the allegations that abovesaid contraband and drug money were given to co-accused by petitioner/accused Vansh Kwatra.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is having clear antecedents and not involved in any other case; that in the



present case he has been nominated on the basis of disclosure statement and the contraband allegedly recovered from the co-accused falls under non commercial quantity and with regard to the drug money, it was recovered from the co-accused and that mother of the co-accused filed an application for releasing the same on superdari; that present petitioner is in custody for the last more than three months; that he is not required for any purpose as he is remanded to judicial custody. Hence, prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner is made.

4. On the other hand, Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. AG, Punjab, appears and files custody certificate of the petitioner, same is taken on record. Learned counsel opposes the bail petition by submitting that present petitioner along with co-accused is involved in drug trafficking and huge cash amount i.e approximately Rs.7,00,000/- and total 20 tablets, which comes under non commercial quantity have been recovered from the co-accused.

5. Heard.

6. Taking into consideration the contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and the facts and circumstances of the case that nothing is recovered from the present petitioner; that he has been nominated on the disclosure statement of co-accused; that he is having clear antecedents and not involved in any other case; that he is in custody for last more than three months and not required for any investigation purpose as already remanded to judicial custody, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. Therefore, without commenting upon the merits and circumstances of the present case, the present petition is **allowed**.



bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of concerned Chief Judicial Magistrate/trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. Pending application(s), if any, also stand **disposed** of accordingly.

22.04.2026	(SUBHAS MEHLA)
mamta	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No