

2026.PHHC.054802



CRM-M-12650-2026

-1-

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

210

CRM-M-12650-2026 (O & M)

Date of decision: 09.04.2026

RAJESH KUMAR

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. N.S.Sodhi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Manjot Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C./483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.72 dated 23.05.2020, registered at Police Station Mehal Kalan, District Barnala, under Sections 21/22/25/29 and 61 NDPS Act, 1985.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for 5 years and about 9 months. He alleges false implication. His name surfaced based on the disclosure statement of co-accused Harish Bhatia, from whom commercial quantity of intoxicating tablets was recovered, while on the disclosure statement of the petitioner, 50000 intoxicating tablets of Clovidol 100-SR containing Tramadol Hydrochloride were recovered from his godown, as he is running a

CRM-M-12650-2026

logistic company of transport and the goods which he received were merely stored there for onward delivery and was not known to him. He became aware only when from one of such box, the alleged took place. No independent witness has been joined at the time of recovery. Four co-accused have since been granted bail. Charges have been framed on 15.10.2022, however, 129 PWs stands examined and there are still 31 more to go. He is not involved in any other case.

3. The custody certificate dated 08.04.2026, filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 5 years, 8 months and 16 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the commercial quantity of intoxicating tablets was recovered from the petitioner. However, she is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage of the case; the petitioner being not involved in any other case and the co-accused having been enlarged on bail.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in **Shariful Islam @ Sarif versus The State of West Bengal SLP (Crl.) No.4173/2022**, decided on 04.08.2022, granted bail to the petitioner in a case of recovery of commercial quantity of contraband, considering incarceration for over 1 year and 6 months and there being no likelihood of completion of trial in the near future, while the Division Bench of this Court in **Bhupender Singh vs. Narcotic Control Bureau (2022) 2 RCR (Crl.) 706**, observed with regard to achieving balance between right to speedy trial guaranteed

CRM-M-12650-2026

under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act.

7. This Court in the case of **Balraj Singh vs. State of Punjab** CRM-M-57386-2022, on 14.12.2022 has followed the dictum laid down by Hon'ble The Supreme Court and granted the bail to the petitioner therein after he had undergone total custody of 1 year and 6 months and in **Munasi Masih vs. State of Punjab**, CRM-M-31504-2022, on 06.2.2023, wherein commercial quantity of contraband had been recovered but only 2 out of 13 PWs had been examined, allowed bail.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 5 years, 8 months and 16 days; not involved in any other case; co-accused are on bail; charges stand framed on 15.10.2022, but out of 160 PWs, 129 have been examined; the trial is likely to take a considerable time; further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act can be diluted bearing in mind the right to a speedy trial, the present petition is allowed.

9. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.

CRM-M-12650-2026

- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

10. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

11. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

09.04.2026

parveen kumar

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

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE