

2026:PHHC:032445



IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

122

CRM-M-65192-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 27.02.2026

Sonu @ Sonu Kalra

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Divij Datt, Advocate and
Ms. Brea Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 157 dated 14.06.2025, registered under Sections 22(c) and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) at Police Station Civil Line, Sonipat, District Sonipat.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the disposal of the present petition are that on 14.06.2025, on the basis of a secret information, the petitioner was apprehended by a police party and recovery of 600 intoxicant tablets containing Tramadol Hydrochloride weighing 289.2 grams and 100 injections of 02 ml each containing same drug was effected from him. Since he could not produce any valid license or permit to keep in his possession the recovered drugs, he was formally arrested at the spot. Upon interrogation, he disclosed that he had procured the recovered contraband from one Aman Kumar, who was also nominated in this case and was arrested on 11.08.2025. After

2026:PHHC:032445



completion of necessary investigation and usual formalities, challan was presented in the Court and presently, the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, the recovery of the alleged contraband, shown to have been effected from the petitioner, was planted upon him. Mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act were not complied with. He has clean antecedents. He has been in custody since 14.06.2025. Investigation has since been completed and challan has been presented. The trial is likely to take a considerable time. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, who was found to be in conscious possession of commercial quantity of contraband, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail as rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act would be attracted against him. Trial is going at a proper pace. It is also argued that if the petitioner is released on bail, he may abscond or indulge in the similar offences. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have been found in conscious possession of the contraband on 14.06.2025. It is an admitted position that the quantity of the recovered contraband falls under commercial quantity. Hence, the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS would obviously be attracted against the petitioner. As regards the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner with

2026:PHHC:032445



regard to non-compliance of the statutory provisions of the NDPS Act during investigation by the police party, the same have direct bearing on the merits of the case, which cannot be looked into at this stage while deciding a bail petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS. Investigation has since been completed and challan has been filed. There is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the trial. The apprehension expressed by learned State counsel that the petitioner, if extended benefit of bail, may abscond or indulge in similar offences can also not be stated to be unfounded. Keeping in view the discussion as made above, the quantity of recovered contraband, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be granted benefit of regular bail, at this stage. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

7. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

27.02.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No