



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

112

CRM-M-56585-2025
Decided on : 06.03.2026

Manpreet Chaunkaria @ Manpreet Chokria . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Shubham Chandel, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, 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 here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Manpreet Chaunkaria @ Manpreet Chokria	340	16.12.2024	22 of the NDPS Act, 1985 [S. 29 of the NDPS Act, added later on]	Phillaur	Jalandhar Rural

2. As per the case of the prosecution, on 16.12.2024, while the police party was patrolling in the area of Phillaur and Zakhira in village Saifabad, Tehang etc., two youths were seen coming on foot from the front side, each holding wax envelopes in their hands. On noticing the police party, they allegedly turned towards a kaccha road. However, both of them were apprehended and upon inquiry disclosed their names as Navdeep



Kumar and Manpreet Chaunkaria @ Manpreet Chokria (**petitioner herein**).

On checking, police allegedly recovered 20 tablets of ETIZOLAM and 50 tablets of ALPRAZOLAM from the possession of co-accused Navdeep Kumar, whereas 15 tablets of ETIZOLAM and 50 tablets of ALPRAZOLAM were recovered from the possession of the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the similarly situated co-accused, namely Navdeep Kumar, who stands on almost identical footing, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 27.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-38244-2025 titled as "*Navdeep Kumar v. State of Punjab*" (Annexure P-3).

Accordingly, on the ground of parity, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner as well.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for bail. However, he is unable to dispute the factual aspects noticed here-above. It is further submitted that recovery of narcotic tablets has been effected from the petitioner and, therefore, considering the nature of the offence under the NDPS Act, petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail at this stage.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the instant petition along with the material available on record. This Court has also taken note of the order dated 27.08.2025 passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of co-accused – Navdeep Kumar.

6. At the outset, it is noticeable that the co-accused – Navdeep Kumar, who was apprehended at the same time and from whom a similar



recovery was effected, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 27.08.2025 (Annexure P-3). Thus, the petitioner seeks the benefit of parity with the said co-accused.

It is further noticeable that the petitioner is a young individual aged about 27 years and conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. Therefore, prolonged pre-trial detention of the petitioner, without the trial reaching its culmination, would seriously prejudice his personal liberty. Though the nature of the offence and the alleged recovery will be examined during the course of trial, yet keeping in view the petitioner's age, and the fact that the co-accused has already been granted bail, his continued detention does not appear to be warranted.

7. In view of the totality of these circumstances, and nature allegations leveled against the petitioner, including the factors noticed here-above, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner, so as to afford the petitioner an opportunity to reform and reintegrate himself in the society.

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**.
Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 06, 2026
J.Ram

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