



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

240+242 (three cases)

CRM-M-9891-2025

Date of Decision: 22.05.2025

(1) Mahesh Kumar Mourya

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CRM-M-11988-2025

(2) Vipin

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CRM-M-13425-2025

(3) Nitesh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Arjun Veer Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-9891-2025.

Mr. Dilpreet Singh Gandhi, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-11988-2025.

Mr. Devender Arya, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-13425-2025.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose off three bail petitions, i.e.,
CRM-M-9891-2025 titled as “ **Mahesh Kumar Mourya Vs. State**



of Haryana”, CRM-M-11988-2025 titled as “**Vipin Vs. State of Haryana** and CRM-M-13425-2025 titled as “**Nitesh 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.118 dated 20.05.2024 under Sections 20(B)(ii)(c), 29 of Narcotics Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act 1985 and later on added 27(a) NDPS Act, 1985, (Annexure P-1) registered at Police Station Industrial Area, District Bhiwani.

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of a complaint moved by Inspector, Virender Singh, who alleged that the police had arrested two co-accused namely, Mohit and Sanoj, while they were keeping 21.660 kgs. of ganga in their conscious possession without any permit or licence. On the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused, Mahesh Kumar Mourya was arrested on 27.05.2024, Vipin was arrested on 20.06.2024 and Nitesh was arrested on 19.06.2024. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) further submit that in fact Nitesh, petitioner in CRM-M-13425-2025 was working in a Q-net Trading Company and Mohit, Sanoj and Vipin, all co-accused were also working in the same company. There was some exchange of money between them, relating to various transactions in the share market. Learned counsel further contend that in the present case, the challan has already been presented against them and it is apparent that no recovery was effected from anyone of them.



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 serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner(s) and they do not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. However, he also admits that no recovery was effected from all the petitioner(s).

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

5. The petitioner(s) are in custody for the last about 11 months and challan has already been presented against them. Moreover, the case of the petitioner(s) is clearly distinguishable from the case of their co-accused namely Mohit and Sanoj, from whom the recovery of 21.660 kg. ganga was effected. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner(s) will not serve any useful purpose.

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

22.05.2025

vipin

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)

JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No