

234 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026 PHH 2 00387



CRM-M-73895-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 14.01.2026

SAURABH @ NONU @ SOURAV ... PETITIONER
VERSUS
STATE OF PUNJAB ... RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. Shivender Pal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Rohit Hans, D.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.126 dated 11.05.2023, under Sections 22(c), 25, 27-A, 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, registered at Police Station City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.
2. The case of the prosecution is that from the possession of one Danish Kapoor @ Noni, 248 strips of Tramadol Hydrochloride tablets were recovered. Thereafter, on the basis of disclosure statement of Danish Kapoor @ Noni, Vishal was nominated from whom 15,200 intoxicating tablets were recovered and on the disclosure statement of Vishal and Danish Kapoor @ Noni, the present petitioner has been nominated.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no recovery has been effected from the present petitioner. The petitioner has undergone actual custody for a period of 01 year, 04 months and 16 days. Apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to implicate the present petitioner in the commission of crime.
4. Notice of motion.
5. Mr. Rohit Hans, D.A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State and vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner

on the ground of gravity of allegations. He has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner has undergone actual custody for a period of 01 year, 04 months and 16 days. The petitioner is involved in two more cases under NDPS Act. Out of 16 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined so far. The petitioner is involved in two more cases under NDPS Act.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. The petitioner has been nominated on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused. No recovery has been effected from him. The petitioner has undergone actual custody for a period of 01 year, 04 months and 16 days. Out of 16 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined so far. The conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

14.01.2026

Janki

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No