



228

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

CRM-M-63044-2024

Date of Decision: 19.12.2024

PANKAJ**...PETITIONER****VS.****STATE OF HARYANA****...RESPONDENT****Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**

Present : Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arun Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.295 dated 15.07.2024, registered under Sections 22-C, 29 NDPS Act, 1985, Police Station SGM Nagar, District Faridabad (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR nor any averment was there, which even remotely connected with the commission of crime. Learned counsel further submits that even 35 injections of Buprenorphine were recovered from Junaid, co-accused. It has been alleged that in the disclosure statement, Junaid had named the petitioner as one of the accomplice. He further contends that except the disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused, there is no other evidence against the petitioner. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on



05.09.2024 and is in custody since then. He further contends that challan has already been presented against him and further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. However, learned State counsel admits that no other criminal case was ever registered against the petitioner.

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

5. In the present case, police had recovered 35 injections of Buprenorphine from Junaid, co-accused. However, no recovery of contraband had taken place from the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody for the last more than 3 months and there are no chances of early conclusion of the trial and the petitioner deserves to be enlarged on regular bail.

6. Without discussing any further on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

19.12.2024
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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