



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.47973 of 2024  
Date of decision: 9<sup>th</sup> December, 2024

Mosim  
... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana  
... Respondent

**CORAM: HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Salman Ahmed, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr. Rahul Mohan, Sr. Dy. Advocate General, Haryana  
for the respondent/State.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 482 BNSS in case FIR No.113 dated 25.06.2023 under Section 22-B of the NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Uttawar, District Palwal.
2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 24.09.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation.

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that a recovery of 528 capsules of tramadol were alleged affected from one Soyab on 25.06.2023; co-accused Soyab then suffered a disclosure statement naming Sakid, who in turn suffered a disclosure statement naming the*

*petitioner as being supplier of the recovered contraband. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents, which clearly hints towards his false implication in the present case, more so when he is just a small time farmer. Learned counsel has also asserted that the disclosure statement on the basis of which he has now been arraigned as an accused in the present FIR, does not hold much evidentiary value.”*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 24.09.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Bheem, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

5. In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 24.09.2024 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./Section 482(2) BNSS. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted to him.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

**December 9, 2024**  
*rps*

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |