



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

241-1

CRM-M-2756 of 2025
Date of decision: 21.07.2025

Puran Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Luvinder Sofat, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Kamal Preet Bawa, DAG, Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.906 dated 13.11.2024, under Sections 18B, 27A and 29 of the NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Shahabad District Kurukshetra.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that co-accused Mohammad Shubhan and Akashdeep were arrested and found in possession of 3 Kg.200 Gram of Opium from the truck bearing No.PB-13-BA-0117. Petitioner was named by his co-accused Mohammad Shubhan in his disclosure statement while he was in custody. It has been alleged that out of the said contraband, 2 kgs. of Opium was to be supplied to the petitioner who is stated to be the owner of the said truck and rest of the Opium was allegedly purchased by co-accused Mohammad Shubhan for himself.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits petitioner was falsely implicated in the present case because apart from the disclosure



statement of the co-accused, there is no evidence to connect the petitioner to the said contraband. He further submits petitioner is in custody for the last 8 months and 01 day as under trial. Trial is likely to take time for its conclusion and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, petitioner be released on regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Kamal Preet Bawa, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 08 days and 01 day.

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

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that apart from disclosure statement there is no evidence on record to connect the petitioner to the contraband, 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 fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

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



9. 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 their bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

21.07.2025
anil

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