



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

218-1

Date of decision: 12.08.2025

1. CRM-M-51168-2024

AADIL

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. Respondent

2. CRM-M-43280-2024

SUSHANT BISOYI

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. Respondent

3. CRM-M-44631-2024

N. SURESH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. Respondent

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

Present:- Ms. Shweta Bawa, Advocate and
Mr. Balraj Gujjar, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-51168-2024).

Mr. R.S. Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-43280-2024).

Mohd. Zeeshan Khan, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-44631-2024).

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. By way of common order, the aforesaid petitions shall be disposed
of which have been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha



Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking regular bail in FIR No.171 dated 29.03.2022 under Sections 20, 29-61-85 of NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Sadar Nuh, District Nuh (Haryana).

2. The case of the prosecution is that on secret information, the petitioner-Aadil alongwith his co-accused namely Mukeem and Mijjan was apprehended while driving a truck allegedly carrying contraband which came out to be 956.750 kgs of ganja.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contends that the petitioner(s) is in custody for more than 03 years and 03 months and only 03 out of total 21 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. He further states that the petitioner(s) is not involved in any other case.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Tapan Masta, Addl. A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. Learned counsel for the State by way of filing of custody certificate dated 27.07.2025 vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail and does not refute the fact that the petitioner(s) is in custody for 03 years, 03 months and 23 days and only 03 out of total 21 prosecution witnesses have been examined.

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, custody period undergone by the petitioner and also the fact that only 03 out of total 21 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and since the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. This Court deems it fit to grant



the concession of regular bail to the petitioner(s).

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner(s) is granted the 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(s) indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner(s).

12th August, 2025
Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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