



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

217

CRM-M No.22472 of 2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 20.05.2026

Surinder Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Saransh Sabharwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG, Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

This is third petition for bail, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the 'Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023'. This petition pertains to a case arising out of FIR No.208 dated 02.10.2024, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 20(c) and 29 of Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, Police Station Kalka, District Panchkula.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'SI Parvinder Singh'. It was reported by the above named police officer that on 02.10.2024 he was leading a team of police officials and performing patrolling duty. As per above named police officer, during the course of patrolling a reliable source gave him a tip-off with regard to possession of large quantity of contraband by the petitioner, who was travelling on a black Activa. As per above named police officer in



view of above mentioned information the Activa of petitioner was intercepted and from his possession 2520 tablets of 'Tramadol HCL', weighing 1468.32 gm. 5520 tablets of 'Lomotil', weighing 303.6 gm. and 4200 tablets of 'Alprazolam', weighing 418.80 gm. were recovered.

3. As per prosecution on recovery of above mentioned contraband, requisite formalities with regard to seizure and sealing of contraband, slapping of FIR and formal arrest of the petitioner were completed and further investigation taken-up.

4. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that this is third petition for bail, and that from the date of dismissal of second petition, no significant progress in trial has taken place. According to learned counsel for the petitioner the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of more than one year and seven months, and that the trial not likely to be concluded in near future.

7. The learned State counsel who has opted not to file any reply in writing, has opposed the bail petition on the ground that from the date of dismissal of former bail petition no significant change in circumstances has taken place. However, it has been conceded by the learned State counsel that out of twenty three prosecution witnesses only two have been examined so far.

8. The record has been perused carefully.



9. At the very outset, it is pertinent to mention here that for maintaining third petition for bail it is necessary for the petitioner to show that from the date of dismissal of former bail petition there is material change in circumstance, but no such ground is available in the present case. In the present case the ground of delay of prolonged incarceration due to delay in trial has been taken by the petitioner, but in view of the fact that the second bail petition was dismissed barely 2 and ½ months ago, the above mentioned ground, too, is not available to the petitioner.

9. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the above mentioned factors, it is hereby observed that the present petition is devoid of merits and deserves dismissal. Hence the same is hereby dismissed accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

20.05.2026
Manoj Bhutani

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