



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

236 (3 cases)+112

CRM-M-10116-2025

Date of Decision: 28.07.2025

(1) Sandeep @ Pandu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CRM-M-57055-2024 (O&M)

(2) Abhishek

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CRM-M-13141-2025

(3) Shashi Parmar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT**

Present : Mr. Kiranpreet S. Sidhu, Advocate with  
Mr. Arjun Veer Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner in CRM-M-10116-2025.

Mr. Anupal Singh Tanwar, Advocate with  
Mr. Manu Sachdeva, Advocate  
for the petitioner in CRM-M-57055-2024.

Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate  
for the petitioner in CRM-M-13141-2025

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*



**N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)**

**CRM-6344-2025 in CRM-M-57055-2024**

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed, subject to just all exceptions.

Annexures P-3 to P-7 are taken on record.

**Main case**

1. This order shall dispose off three bail petitions, i.e., CRM-M-10116-2025 titled as **“Sandeep @ Pandu Vs. State of Haryana”**, CRM-M-57055-2024 titled as **“Abhishek Vs. State of Haryana”** and CRM-M-13141-2025 titled as **“Shashi Parmar Vs. State of Haryana”** whereby, the petitioner(s) have applied for grant of regular bail under Section 483 of the BNSS in case FIR No.293 dated 03.08.2024 under Sections 22(c), 25, 27-A, 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 and (Section 318(4) of BNS, 2023 added later on) registered at Police Station Tosham, District Bhiwani.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, on 03.08.2024, Sher Singh, SI conducted search of a vehicle, which was driven by Parveen, co-accused and on personal search of Parveen, 3800 tablets of Lorazepam were recovered from him. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submit that all the three petitioner(s) were not named in the FIR and have been falsely involved without any basis. In fact during the course of investigation, Parveen, co-accused had named



Sandeep @ Pandu and Shashi Parmar as his accomplices. Later on Sandeep @ Pandu (petitioner in CRM-M-10116-2025) and Shashi Parmar (petitioner in CRM-M-13141-2025) were arrested by the police on 06.08.2024. During the course of investigation, Shashi Parmar had named Abhishek as the main supplier of contraband in the present case and even Abhishek (petitioner in CRM-M-57055-2024) was arrested by the police on 08.08.2024. Learned counsel further submit that in the present case, except the disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused, there was no other evidence against them. Moreover, the petitioner(s) are continuing in custody for the last almost 01 year and no witness has been examined so far.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s) on the ground that during the course of investigation, sufficient evidence has been collected against all the 03 petitioner(s). Not only repeated call details have been found between the accused, but there are several financial transactions between the accused, which conclusively prove their involvement in the drug strains. All the 03 petitioner(s) were actively involved in the commission of crime and were the suppliers of Parveen, who was apprehended at the spot. Further, Sandeep @ Pandu, (petitioner in CRM-M-10116-2025) is involved one more case under the provisions of NDPS Act.



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

5. In the present case, it is not in dispute that no recovery was effected from the petitioner(s) after their arrest by the police. Moreover, all the petitioner(s) are in custody for the last 01 year and their further custody will not serve any useful purpose. Further, the prosecution is yet to lead evidence before the trial Court with regard to involvement of the petitioner(s) in the crime.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petitions are allowed. The petitioner(s) are ordered to be released on bail pending trial on their furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate subject to the following conditions:-

*(i) The petitioner(s) shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade their to disclose such facts to the Court or to any other authority.*

*(ii) The petitioner(s) shall remain present before the Court on the dates fixed for hearing of the case.*

*(iii) The petitioner(s) shall not absent themselves from the Court proceedings except on the prior permission of the Court concerned.*

*(iv) The petitioner(s) shall surrender their passports, if any, (if already not surrendered), and in case they are*



*not holder of the same, they shall swear an affidavit to that effect.*

*(v) The petitioner(s) shall also file their affidavit before the concerned Court, mentioning his ordinary place of residence and number of mobile phone, which shall be used by them during the pendency of the trial. In case of change of place of residence/mobile number, they shall share the details with the concerned Court/learned Trial Court.*

*(vi) In case, the petitioner(s) are involved in any other criminal activity, during the pendency of the trial, it shall be viewed seriously.*

*(vii) The concerned Court may insist on two local sureties and may also impose any other condition, in accordance with law, while accepting the bails bonds and surety bonds of the petitioner(s).*

7. In case, the petitioner(s) violates any of the conditions mentioned above, it shall be viewed seriously and the concession of bail granted to them shall be liable to be cancelled and the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application in this regard.

28.07.2025  
vipin

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)  
JUDGE

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