



136

**THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRA-S No.1154 of 2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.04.2026**

Ram Kumar

..... Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Karandeep Singh, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present appeal has been filed by the appellant, namely, Ram Kumar against the judgment dated 30.01.2026 and order of sentence dated 02.02.2026 passed by the learned Judge, Special Court, Fazilka vide which he was convicted in a case bearing FIR No.43, dated 05.04.2020, under Section 22 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Khuian Sarwar, District Fazilka and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of 01 year and to pay a fine of Rs.2,000/- and in default of payment of fine to further undergo rigorous imprisonment for 15 days under Section 22(b) of NDPS Act.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that on 05.04.2020, ASI Lekh Raj along with SC Kuldeep Singh and other police officials were on



patrolling in the area Khue Khera to Rukanpura Khui Khera and when they reached near Rukanpura Khui Khera, they saw a young man coming from the opposite side, who was carrying a black colour polythene bag in his right hand. On seeing the police, he got perplexed and threw the polythene bag on the ground, however, on suspicion, he was apprehended by the police party. On asking, he disclosed his name to be Ram Kumar. He was suspected to be carrying some contraband in the polythene bag which was thrown by him and, thus, search of the same was conducted. On conducting the search of the polythene bag, 250 loose intoxicant tablets were recovered. He failed to produce any licence regarding the conscious possession of the same, thus, the FIR was registered and he was arrested on the spot. The samples taken were sent to the FSL. On receipt of the FSL report, the contraband recovered weighs 99.060 grams of Tramadol Hydrochloride. However, the investigation was completed and after the trial, the appellant was convicted and sentenced as stated above by the learned trial Court, hence this appeal has been filed by the appellant challenging his conviction and sentenced detailed above.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that he does not want to challenge the conviction of appellant on merits but as far as sentence part is concerned, he prays that the same may be reduced to that of already undergone by the appellant. He has submitted that the present case pertains to the year 2020 and the appellant has already undergone the actual sentence of 03 months and 06 days of the total awarded sentence of 01 year by the learned trial Court. He has further submitted



that though the appellant is involved in 02 other cases, however, in both the cases, he is on bail. He has submitted that as such a lenient view be taken and the sentence awarded be reduced to that of already undergone.

4. Custody certificate of the appellant dated 04.04.2026 has been filed by learned State counsel today in the Court and the same is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the appellant.

5. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the contentions raised by learned counsel for the appellant. He has submitted that the appellant is involved in two more cases. He has submitted that the present appeal is liable to be dismissed.

6. Heard.

7. Admittedly the present case pertains to year 2020 and the appellant was convicted and sentenced, as stated above, in the year 2026 and thus he has faced a protracted trial for about 06 years. There is nothing on record to show that during this period, the appellant has indulged in any unlawful activity. A perusal of the custody certificate produced by the learned State counsel shows that the appellant is involved in two more cases, however he is on bail in both the cases.

8. Keeping in view all the abovesaid factors into consideration, the conviction awarded by the learned trial Court to the appellant is upheld and maintained as the same has not been challenged on merits. As far as the sentence part is concerned, this Court deems it appropriate to



reduce the sentence from 01 year to the period already undergone by the appellant.

9. With the above said observations, the appeal stands disposed of. Pending applications bearing CRM-14533-2026 and CRM-14534-2026, also stand disposed of.

06.04.2026
rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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