



238

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

CRM-M-38707-2025

Date of Decision:25.07.2025

AJAY MEHAR

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

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

Present : Mr. Parminder Singh Sekhon, Advocate &
Mr. Rajdeep Singh Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 BNSS with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.42 dated 06.03.2025, registered under Section 20 and 27-A of NDPS Act 1985, Police Station Nangal Chaudhri, Police District Mahendergarh, District Narnaul.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the case set up by the prosecution, Mukesh and Rajpal were apprehended by the police, while they were carrying 159.110 kg. of *ganjapatti* in the truck, without any permit or licence He further submits that on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by Mukesh and Rajpal, Subhash was apprehended by the police. Later on, Subhash suffered two disclosure statements and in the second



disclosure statement, the name of the petitioner had surfaced. He next contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 09.03.2025 and no other criminal case ever registered against him.

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.

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

5. In the present case, the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 09.03.2025 and no recovery was effected from him. Even, the main accused namely Mukesh and Rajpal are already in custody. After completion of investigation, the challan has been presented against the petitioner and the prosecution has not been able to examine even a single witness so far. Thus, the trial is not likely to conclude in near future and 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.

25.07.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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