

CRM-M-31776-2025 (O&M)

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

2025.PHHC:075975



**CRM-M-31776-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 12.06.2025**

TARUN KHANNA

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Suresh Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Kashyap, D.A.G., Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No. 229 dated 07.04.2025 under Section 18 NDPS Act (later on added Sections 18-B, 27A and 29 NDPS Act) registered at Police Station Sadar Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that recovery of 2.600 kilograms of opium has been effected from co-accused namely Sukhwinder Singh and Balbir Singh and the name of the petitioner has not been mentioned in the FIR. He further submits that the petitioner has been implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statements of co-accused and the same is inadmissible and is not a piece of evidence. No recovery has been effected from the conscious possession of the petitioner. He further submits that there is only a disclosure statement against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 10.04.2025. He further submits that similarly placed co-accused namely Vikram Singh @ Vikki has already been granted regular bail vide order dated 29.05.2025 passed in CRM-M-29059-2025 by the Co-ordinate Bench of this

CRM-M-31776-2025 (O&M)

Court.

3. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. On asking, learned State counsel confirms that there is only disclosure statement of the co-accused against the petitioner and no other evidence has come on record. He has not denied the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 10.04.2025.

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

5. There is no other evidence collected against the petitioner except the disclosure statement made by the co-accused. No recovery has been effected from the petitioner. Since the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

6. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

7. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order, the applicant is found indulging in any other criminal case it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

8. Pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

12.06.2025

Janki

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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