



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

253

CRM-M-40452-2025

Date of Decision:-04.08.2025

Muneshwar Kumar Yadav

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Parminder Singh Sekhon, Advocate for the petitioner.

H. S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking regular bail in FIR No.47 dated 16.01.2025 under Sections 18, 27-A and 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station City Karnal, District Karnal.

2. The case of the prosecution is that upon received a secret information, a raid was conducted and 3 Kg '*opium*' was recovered from Dhiru Kumar Yadav and Sunaina Devi, who on their disclosure statement named the present petitioner, being the supplier of the said contraband. However, apart from said disclosure statement of co-accused, there is no other evidence on record against the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is being nominated as an accused only on the basis of disclosure statement, which would hardly carry any evidentiary value. It has been submitted that the petitioner case has been behind the bars since last about 06 months and 9



days and the trial has not commenced till date. The petitioner is not involved in any other case.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and has filed custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record.

6. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail by stating that the petitioner has undergone custody for a period of 06 months and 09 days and does not refute the fact that the trial is yet to commence as challan has not been presented yet. He further submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and particularly the aforesaid recovery, and the fact that the custody period undergone by the petitioner for about a period of 6 months and 9 days; that the petitioner is not involved in any other case and also the fact that trial is yet to commence as challan has not been presented till now, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice and also conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time. Therefore, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the



satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. The pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

10. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

04.08.2025
geeta

(H. S. Grewal)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No