



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

212

CRM-M-27320-2025

Date of decision : 14.07.2025

SUKHNEET SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H. S. GREWAL**Present:-** Mr. J. S. Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.284 dated 15.09.2024 under Sections 22(c), 27-A of NDPS Act registered at Police Station Sadar Tohana, District Fatehabad.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 15.09.2025, on the basis of secret information, the police party apprehended one Surender Singh from whom following contraband was recovered:

- i) 37 cardboard boxes of Celcidale NRx Tramadol Hydrochloride tablets 100 mg., total weighing 07 kg. 363 grams;
- ii) 03 boxes containing total 150 strips of Clovvidol-100 SR tablets Nrx Tramadol Hydrochloride SR tablets IP 100 mg., total weighing 861 grams; and
- iii) 04 boxes containing total 240 strips of Quiler 0.5 Nrx Alprazolam Tablets IP 0.5 mg., total weighing 333 grams 06 miligrams.



3. The co-accused Surender Singh was arrested who during investigation, named Mandeep, Virender Kumar @ Binder and Amar Singh Bidhuri @ Bittu. The said co-accused namely Mandeep, Virender Kumar @ Binder and Amar Singh Bidhuri @ Bittu were arrested who on their disclosure statements allegedly named the present petitioner for his involvement in the offence. During investigation, it has come forth that 18,500 tablets of Tramadol recovered from co-accused Surender Singh have been manufactured by “Ampure Pharmaceutical Limited” and the said tablets were sold against bill by manufacturing company to another company in the name of “Bright Life Surety”, Anarwala, Dehradun which is run by the present petitioner.

4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and the petitioner is a licence holder of the company and is a stockist. He further states that the said contraband went missing while shifting the location of his office within the periphery of Dehradun and to this effect, the petitioner got registered a DDR dated 05.03.2025 at Police Station Cantt, Dehradun.

5. Learned counsel for the State opposes the grant of bail on the ground that the allegations made against the petitioner are grave in nature and prays for dismissal of the anticipatory bail. He further states that the present FIR lodged against the petitioner pertains to 15.09.2024 whereas the missing DDR report of contraband from the petitioner’s office was lodged much after the registration of the present FIR i.e. on 05.03.2025.

6. I have heard learned counsel for both the parties and have considered the allegations against the petitioner.

7. Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances and the fact the heavy recovery of contraband and the alleged involvement of the petitioner, this Court is of the view that the allegations involved in the present case are serious



in nature and as such, he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail. Therefore, no ground is made out to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

July 14, 2025
Sonia Puri

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