



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

220-1

CRM-M-28469-2025
Date of decision: 27.05.2025

Sarik Saifi @ Sharik Saifi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Rajesh Sethi, Advocate, with
Mr. Arun Biriwal, Advocate,
Mr. Anshuman Sethi, Advocate,
Ms. Preeti Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in FIR No.0043 dated 19.02.2025, under Sections 22(c) of NDPS Act, 1985 (Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on), registered at Police Station Mullana, District Ambala, Haryana.

2. The case of the prosecution is that accused Om Parkash @ Vicky was arrested and contraband recovered from him i.e. 50 strips (24 capsules in one strip) of Spasmed capsules [50 x 24= 1200 capsules) containing salt Acetaminophen, Tramadol HCL & Dicyclomine HCL and 90 strips (24 capsules in each strip) [90 x 24 = 2160 capsules) of Proximo Spas containing salt Acetaminophen, Tramadol Hydrochloride Dicyclomine Hydrochloride Capsules; total weight of the recovered 3360 capsules comes to 1 kg 941.8 grams. During investigation, it has come out that that the said contraband was to be supplied by one Sanjeev Kumar @Vicky and Mukul



Moudgil and further alleged that he has brought the capsules from accused Zakir Hussain @ Zakir @ Kaif and on his disclosure one Sumit was named and present petitioner- Sarik Saifi @ Sharik Saifi was named by Sumit. The petitioner was arrested on 27.02.2025. It is stated that the petitioner was not involved in any other case and apart from disclosure of co-accused namely Sumit, no other evidence has been surfaced against the petitioner. Moreover, he has undergone around 3 months in custody and the trial is likely to take a long time, petitioner be released on regular bail.

3. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner and he contends that the petitioner is in custody for the last 3 months.

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

5. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel, and the fact that petitioner is in custody for the last 3 months, as of today he is not involved in any other case and the trial is likely to take long time; the 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 a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

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



7. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

27.05.2025
anil

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