



245

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

CRM-M-28441-2025

Date of Decision:23.07.2025

JAGDEEP SINGH ALIAS VIKKA

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Shiv K. Sharma, Advocate,
Mr. Kartik Gandhi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the 2nd petition under Section 483 BNSS with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.108 dated 21.04.2024, registered under Sections 15(C)/25/29/61/85 Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, Police Station Ding, District Sirsa.

2. Learned Senior counsel submits that as per the case of the prosecution, Vikas Kumar, main accused was apprehended by the police, while he was carrying 2245 kg. of poppy-husk in the truck. After his arrest, the statement of Vikas Kumar was also recorded by the police, who stated that Om Parkash, owner of the truck had handed over the poppy-husk to him and even Om Parkash was arrayed as accused in the present case. Learned Senior counsel further submits that the name of the petitioner had also cropped up in the



disclosure statement of Vikas Kumar and the petitioner was also arrayed as accused. He further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 01.05.2025 and no recovery was effected from him. Even challan has been presented against him. However, 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 on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. However, he admits that no recovery was effected from him in the present case. He further submits that 01 more FIR No.14/2024 under Section 25/29/8/15 NDPS Act, Mandsaur is pending against the petitioner, however, the petitioner is on bail in the said case.

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

5. In the present case, admittedly no recovery has been effected from the petitioner and he is in custody for the last about 01 year and 02 months. Moreover, the challan has already been filed against him and the trial Court may take considerable time to conclude the trial. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

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

23.07.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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