

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:069006



230

CRM-M-19199-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision:04.05.2026

Vikas Harish @ Vicky

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Raj Kumar Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vivek Sharma, AAG, Punjab.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. The instant one is the third petition for grant of regular bail as filed by the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No.103, dated 13.08.2024, registered under Sections 21, 25 and 29 of the NDPS Act, at Police Station Dugri, District Ludhiana. The first petition as filed by him bearing CRM-M-50778-2024 had been dismissed on 24.02.2025 whereas the second petition bearing CRM-M-70283-2025 had been dismissed on 16.02.2026.

2. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that after dismissal of his previous petition, there is a change in the circumstances as co-accused, Sandeep Singh, Savita Garg Deepak Garg and Rahul Hans @ Rahul have been extended benefit of regular bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. Each day spent by him in

custody has furnished a new ground to him to seek concession of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be granted benefit of regular bail.

3. Status report and the custody certificate of the petitioner have been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that instant one is the successive bail petition and his previous petition had been dismissed only on 16.02.2026. The case of the petitioner is not even at parity with the case of co-accused, who have been extended benefit of bail after dismissal of his second petition. No ground has been made out for allowing this petition and it has been filed to misuse the process of law. It is, also argued that this being the successive petition is not even maintainable and is liable to be dismissed.

4. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. The first petition as filed by the petitioner had been dismissed on 05.02.2025 and the second one had been dismissed only on 16.02.2026. The petitioner is claiming parity with the co-accused Rahul Hans @ Rahul and Sandeep Singh. However, his case cannot be stated to be at parity with them since recovery of commercial quantity of intoxicating tablets had been effected from his conscious possession. The rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act are attracted against him. Undoubtedly, a successive bail petition is maintainable but for such petition to succeed, the petitioner must show some substantial or drastic change in the circumstances which has not been shown in this case. Rather, it clearly appears to the Court that this petition has been filed to misuse the

process of law as it has been filed within a short span of time from the dismissal of his previous petition. As such, finding no compelling ground to allow the petition, the same is dismissed.

6. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial.

7. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

04.05.2026

harjeet

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

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE