



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

212

CRM-M-48919-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 14.11.2025

Ravi Kumar ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Harshit Ahuja, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.523, dated 11.10.2019, registered under Section 21(B) of NDPS Act, at Police Station City Fatehabad, District Fatehabad.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the present petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and the allegation against the present petitioner is that 7 grams of ‘heroin’ has been recovered from him, which is marginally above the small quantity. The petitioner is in custody since 03.06.2025, i.e. for the last about 5 months. Learned counsel further contended that the petitioner was granted bail on merits by the trial Court, however, he absented himself and was hence declared proclaimed person vide order dated 19.05.2025 (Annexure P-3). He further contended that the petitioner is a young man of aged about 24 years only and if he



CRM-M-48919-2025 (O&M)

(2)

remains behind bar, it will diminish his future and he is not involved in any other case, hence, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana, puts in appearance as advance copy of petition had been served to respondent-State and opposes the bail petition of the petitioner by submitting that out of total 13 prosecution witnesses, only 04 PWs have been examined. He further submits that the contraband recovered from the present petitioner is 7 grams of 'heroin', which falls under intermediate quantity. Thus, he prayed for dismissal of his bail.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case; particularly the fact that the contraband recovered from the possession of the petitioner is marginally above small quantity; he is in custody for the last about 5 months; the petitioner is a young man of 24 years of age; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment as culpability is to be decided by trial Court after appreciating evidence adduced by the parties, and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. 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 bonds to the satisfaction of the trial



CRM-M-48919-2025 (O&M) (3)

Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned, subject to the condition that his presence can be secured during trial.

8. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be expression of an opinion by this Court on merits of the case. The learned Court below is directed to proceed with the matter on its own merits, lest it may prejudice the trial.

14.11.2025
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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