



CRM-M-16703-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

219

CRM-M-16703-2026
Decided on : 02.04.2026

Sanjeev Kumar @ Chopra

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Himmat Singh Sidhu, Legal Aid Counsel
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh Gill, Addl. A.G., Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Sanjeev Kumar @ Chopra, aged 44 years	57	25.02.2025	22(b)/61/85 of NDPS Act, 1985	City Faridkot	Faridkot

2. As per allegations, members of the police team noticed that two young men were sitting on the floor, under the light of electricity poll, installed at that place. On reaching near to them, some strips of tablets were lying there on floor. One black color polythene bag was also noticed in the hand of one of the accused,

**CRM-M-16703-2026****2**

who later on disclosed his name as Harjinder Singh @ Bhatti. Second person disclosed his name as Sanjeev Kumar @ Chopra (petitioner herein). However, nothing was noticed by the police in his hand. On making search of the polythene bag, total 490 tablets of Tramadol Hydrochloride were recovered and as per FSL report, average weight of one tablet containing the salt of Tramadol Hydrochloride was found as 270 mg/tablets.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that total weight of the salt of the tablets comes out to be 132.3 grams of Tramadol Hydrochloride, which is significantly less than the 'commercial quantity' threshold of more than 250 grams. He also refers to the impugned order, wherein learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridkot specifically observed that recovered contraband falls within the ambit of non-commercial quantity, however, noticing that the quantity was 'very huge', the prayer for bail was declined.

Learned counsel argues that the trial Court has, infact, given contradictory observations that go against the statutory provisions. The Court could not have drawn its own impression that the quantity is 'very huge', once it was admittedly found to be non-commercial, as per the schedule under the NDPS Act. He further submits that petitioner is inside jail for the last more than a period of 01 year and 02 months (since 25.02.2025). Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, there are four other cases pending against the petitioner but none of the case is under the provisions of NDPS Act.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made in the petition, however, he does not dispute the factual position as narrated by the petitioner's counsel. About the stage of trial, learned State counsel submits that out of total 15 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till



CRM-M-16703-2026

date.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and examined the relevant material available on record with their able assistance.

6. Considering all the aforementioned circumstances and the fact that no recovery of contraband/narcotic tablets was effected from the possession of the petitioner, this Court deems it appropriate to consider his plea of bail.

7. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

10. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

April 02, 2026

reena

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**