



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

229

CRM-M-1894-2025
Date of decision: 10.07.2025

SATISH KUMAR

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Aayush Gupta, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ankur Jain, Advocate for the complainant.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking regular bail in FIR No.147 dated 02.09.2022 under Section 22 of NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Adampur, District Jalandhar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on secret information a raid was conducted in the premises of the petitioner, however none was apprehended at the spot and 165 intoxicant injections of Avil, 170 injections of *buprenorphine*, 150 intoxicant tablets of Tramadol and 72 capsules of Tramadol were recovered from a cot which was lying in the premises belonging to the petitioner. The petitioner and co-accused i.e. his wife both were not present at the premises.



Moreover, no independent person from the locality was joined in the search of the house.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was residing at the rented accommodation. Neither does the place of recovery i.e. the house belong to him, nor the alleged recovery was effected from his conscious possession.

4. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail by way of filing of custody certificate dated 09.07.2025 and further states that the petitioner has undergone actual custody period of 02 years, 10 months and 04 days and 05 out of 10 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that the custody period undergone by the petitioner is 02 years, 10 months and 04 days and also, 05 out 10 prosecution witnesses have been examined, the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time and as such, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Therefore, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate



concerned. The pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

8. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

10th July, 2025

Sonia Puri

**(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE**

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