



222

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

CRM-M-5625-2025

Date of decision :21.08.2025

Jai Parkash**.....Petitioner****versus****State of Haryana****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Deepak, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.39 dated 22.02.2024, under Sections 20 & 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Dujana, Jhajjar, District Jhajjar.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that on 22.02.2024, the police party while on patrolling, received a secret information to the effect that Somveer, Sukhveer and Jai Parkash (petitioner) were involved in smuggling of Ganja. It was informed that they were going from Jhajjar towards Hisar via Rohtak in a Honda City Car bearing No.HR-51-AP-1583 and if the barricading is laid, they could be arrested along with the contraband. On receiving the information, the raiding party was constituted and laid the barricading at the disclosed place. Thereafter, a car was seen coming from Jhajjar in which 03 persons were travelling. They were apprehended and on asking, the driver disclosed his name as Somveer, the person sitting on the passanger side disclosed his name as



Jai Parkash (present petitioner) and the 3rd person who was sitting on the rear seat, disclosed his name as Sukhveer. They were suspected to be carrying some contraband and thus, the search was conducted. On conducting the search of the car, a plastic bag of blue colour was recovered from the dikki and on search of the same, 45 kgs of ganja was recovered. They failed to produce any licence regarding the possession of the same and thus, they all were arrested on the spot. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. Samples taken from the contraband were sent to FSL. On receiving the FSL report, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial Court commenced with the trial. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jhajjar for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, the same was declined by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jhajjar vide order dated 30.10.2024. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case on the basis of secret information. He submits that there is violation of Section 42 of NDPS Act. He submits that the compliance of Section 50 of NDPS Act, is mandatory, however, there is violation of the same as well. He submits that the alleged recovery has been effected from a public place, however, no independent witness was joined by the investigating agency. He submits that petitioner is involved in 02 more FIRs, however, one of them is under the NDPS Act and in both these FIRs, the petitioner is on bail. He has submitted that the petitioner has completed an incarceration of about 1 ½ years, however, the trial is not concluded yet. Hence, the right of petitioner of speedy trial is miserably



defeated. He thus, submits that in the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner and submits that on receiving of a specific information, the petitioner and the co-accused were arrested on spot. He submits that the contraband recovered weighed 45 Kgs of *Ganja*, which falls under the category of commercial quantity and thus, provisions of Section 37 of NDPS Act, are attracted in the present case. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 22 prosecution witnesses, only 08 witnesses have been examined so far. He has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner on record.

5. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the FIR has been registered on the basis of secret information. As submitted, out of total 22 prosecution witnesses, only 08 witnesses have been examined so far. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 years, 05 months and 28 days as on 20.08.2025. It further shows that the petitioner is involved in 02 other cases out of which one case is under the NDPS Act, however, he is on bail in that case.

6. In view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court cannot ignore the fact that the speedy trial is the fundamental right of every accused. As held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Mohd Muslim @ Hussain Vs. State (NCT of Delhi), 2023 LiveLaw(SC)260**, this Court is of the opinion that the case of the petitioner is covered by the ratio of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. In the abovesaid case Hon'ble Supreme Court expressed its views as under:-

19. A plain and literal interpretation of the conditions under



Section 37 (i.e., that Court should be satisfied that the accused is not guilty and would not commit any offence) would effectively exclude grant of bail altogether, resulting in punitive detention and unsanctioned preventive detention as well. Therefore, the only manner in which such special conditions as enacted under Section 37 can be considered within constitutional parameters is where the court is reasonably satisfied on a prima facie look at the material on record (whenever the bail application is made) that the accused is not guilty. Any other interpretation, would result in complete denial of the bail to a person accused of offences such as those enacted under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.


20. xxxxx

21.it would be important to reflect that laws which impose stringent conditions for grant of bail, may be necessary in public interest; yet, if trials are not concluded in time, the injustice wrecked on the individual is immeasurable.

22. xxxxx

23. *There is a further danger of the prisoner turning to crime, “as crime not only turns admirable, but the more professional the crime, more honour is paid to the criminal”²² (also see Donald Clemmer’s ‘The Prison Community’ published in 1940²³). Incarceration has further deleterious effects - where the accused belongs to the weakest economic strata: immediate loss of livelihood, and in several cases, scattering of families as well as loss of family bonds and alienation from society. The courts therefore, have to be sensitive to these aspects (because in the event of an acquittal, the loss to the accused is irreparable), and ensure that trials – especially in cases, where special laws enact stringent provisions, are taken up and concluded speedily.*

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take



sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court/Duty Magistrate.

21.08.2025
ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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