

2025:PHHC:130057



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

219

CRM-M-18552-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 19.09.2025

Raj Kishore Kumar**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Sandeep K. Sharm, Advocate,
Mr. Lakshya Saini, Advocate and
Mr. Utsav Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 302 dated 11.05.2022, registered under Section 20-C of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) at Police Station City Rohtak, District Rohtak.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that on 11.05.2022, on the basis of a secret information, the petitioner apprehended by a police party and recovery of 02 kgs. of Charas was effected from him. He was formally arrested at the spot. After completion of necessary investigation and usual formalities, challan was presented in the Court and presently, the petitioner is facing trial for commission of aforesaid offence.

2025:PHHC:130057



3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, a false recovery was planted upon him. Even otherwise, investigation has been completed long back and *challan* has been presented in Court. However, trial is substantially delayed as despite the fact that *challan* was presented on 01.08.2022, out of total 15 prosecution witnesses, only 05 witnesses have been examined so far and there is no likelihood of the trial being completed in near future. He is in custody since 11.05.2022 i.e. for the last more than 03 years and 04 months. His involvement in other case cannot be made a ground to deny him concession of bail. In view of substantial delay in trial, the petitioner is entitled to get benefit of bail. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have also gone through the record carefully.

6. As per the allegations, the petitioner was found to be in possession of 02 kgs. of Charas on 11.05.2022. The petitioner is in custody since the date of registration of the FIR. On going through the record, it is apparent that the trial is substantially delayed as only 05 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far out of total 15 witnesses, despite the fact that *challan* was presented way back 01.08.2022. The petitioner has been in long incarceration of more than 03 years and 04 months. The trial is obviously delayed and there is no likelihood of the same to conclude in near future.

2025:PHHC:130057



Pendency of a similar case cannot be made a ground for denying him concession of bail in given circumstances. Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Rabi Prakash vs. State of Odisha : 2023 Live Law (SC) 533*** has held that the prolonged incarceration, generally militates against the most precious fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution and in such a situation, the conditional liberty must override the statutory embargo created under Section 37(1)(b)(ii) of the NDPS Act. Similar view has been taken by Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ankur Chaudhary vs. State of Madhya Pradesh : 2024 (4) RCR (Criminal) 172***. Reliance can also be placed upon ***Mohd. Muslim @ Hussain vs. State (NCT of Delhi) : 2023 AIR(SC) 1648 2023 AIR(SC) 1648***, wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court, while granting concession of regular bail to an accused, from whom commercial quantity of the contraband was allegedly recovered, has held that grant of bail on the ground of undue delay in trial cannot be said to be fettered by Section 37 of the NDPS Act. Reference can also be made to the authority cited as ***Satender Kumar Antil vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and another, 2022(10) SCC 51***, wherein similar observations were made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Reliance can also be placed upon the authority cited as ***Bhupender Singh vs. Narcotic Control Bureau : (2022) 2 RCR (Criminal) 706***, wherein a Division Bench of this Court, after considering issue with respect to achieving balance between right to speedy trial guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and the rigors enumerated under Section 37 of the NDPS Act, has held that convict/accused is not precluded from claiming bail invoking parameters of Article 21 of the Constitution of India *de-hors* the stringent provisions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act. In the present case, apparently and evidently, the trial is substantially delayed. Therefore, keeping in view the aforementioned

2025:PHHC:130057



facts and circumstances and also the ratio of law as laid down in the aforecited authorities, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it will be open for the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail in case the petitioner is found involved in any other subsequent case.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

19.09.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No