

121 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH



CRM-M-69855-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 24.02.2026

ROHIT @ NADDA ... PETITIONER
VERSUS
STATE OF PUNJAB ... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Armaan Gagneja, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rishabh Singla, A.A.G., Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) in FIR No.138 dated 11.08.2023, under Section 22(c) of NDPS Act registered at Police Station City, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 11.08.2023, the Investigating Officer, along with other police officials, was on routine patrol duty in the area of Kotli Road in search of miscreants. During patrolling, the petitioner was apprehended on suspicion as he was carrying a black coloured polythene bag. Upon searching the polythene bag that the applicant had thrown at the spot, the Investigating Officer recovered three strips of Etizolam Mouth Dissolving Tablets (Etazip MD 0.5), each strip containing 10 tablets, totaling 30 tablets. The petitioner failed to produce any valid license or permit for possession of the said tablets.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he is in custody for a period of 02 years, 06 months and 11 days.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the bail application and submitted that the quantity of contraband recovered from the possession of the petitioner falls under commercial quantity. The petitioner is involved in four more cases. However, it is stated that out of 15, only 4 witnesses remain to be examined.

5. The quantity of contraband recovered from the possession of the petitioner falls under the category of commercial quantity. The petitioner is also involved in four other cases, which indicates that he does not have clean antecedents. Considering the seriousness and gravity of the allegations, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of bail. In view of the overall facts and circumstances of the case, no exceptional or extraordinary grounds are made out for granting regular bail to the petitioner.

6. Dismissed.

7. However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to move a fresh application for bail in case the trial does not make substantial progress in a reasonable time.

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

24.02.2026
Janki

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