



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

130

CRM-M-52235-2025(O&M)

Date of decision: 24.03.2026

Sandeep Puri @ Gauswami Sandip Puri

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Vikram Rathore, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Astt. AG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant first petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.414 dated 19.11.2021 registered under Section 22C of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station City Mandi Dabwali, District Sirsa.

2. Briefly summarized, facts of the present case are that on 19.11.2021 while police party was on patrolling duty, two persons came on a motorcycle Royal Enfield black colour having registration No.HR-25-H-6935. On seeing the police officials, they tried to turn back, however, on suspicion, they were apprehended. The said persons disclosed their name as Piter Chand and Kuldeep Singh @ Deepa and from their possession 4000 NRX Tramadol prolonged release tablets IP 100mg were recovered.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that name of the petitioner surfaced in the present case on the disclosure statement made by co-accused Peter Chand and Kuldeep Singh @ Deepa, from whom the contraband had been recovered to the effect that they had procured the said contraband from the petitioner herein. He further contends that the



petitioner being the pharmacist has thus been nominated with the aid of Section 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985. He further contends that the said co-accused Kuldip Singh @ Deepa and Peter Chand have already been granted concession of regular bail vide order dated 07.08.2024 passed in CRM-M-34499-2024 and 04.09.2024 passed in CRM-M-41460-2024 respectively.

4. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the aforesaid facts.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended along with the present petition.

6. Taking into consideration that the main accused from whom the recovery had been effected have already been granted concession of regular bail, the name of the petitioner surfaced on the disclosure of the said co-accused and that no further recovery had been effected from the petitioner coupled with the fact that only charges have been framed and trial has not made any headway despite a total of 24 prosecution witnesses, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition.

7. The instant petition is *allowed* and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.



10. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

24.03.2026

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)

Sumit Gusain

JUDGE

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