

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:154546



240/2

CRM-M-33287-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 10.11.2025.

Sahil @ Vishal

...Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

.....

Present: Mr. Pradeep Chhoker, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sulinder Kumar, DAG, Haryana.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J.

Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.746 dated 12.12.2024, under Sections 22-C of the NDPS Act (Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on), registered at Police Station Industrial Sector-29, District Panipat.

As per prosecution case, 15 injections containing 30ml NRX Buprenorphine were recovered from the possession of co-accused Wahid. The petitioner was nominated as an accused in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused Sameer, who stated that he had purchased the aforesaid injections from him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that no recovery had been effected from the petitioner and he is not connected with the offence in the present case. The petitioner has not been named in the FIR and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He was nominated as an accused in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused

Sameer, which is not admissible in law and as trial of the case is likely to take time, therefore, the petitioner be granted concession of regular bail.

Learned State counsel has opposed the petition and submitted that the petitioner is actively involved in the alleged offence. He has been specifically named in the disclosure statement of co-accused and as such he is not entitled to the concession of bail.

Heard.

As per the allegations, the name of the petitioner surfaced in the present case, on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Sameer. Recovery had already been effected in the present case and nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody since 09 months and 18 days. Conclusion of trial is likely to take time, so no useful purpose would be served by further detaining the petitioner behind the bars.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail, on furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds, to the satisfaction of concerned learned trial Judge/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate.

However, nothing observed herein above shall be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The observations recorded above are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail petition.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

10.11.2025.

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