



CRM-M-67876-2025

1

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

233

CRM-M-67876-2025
Decided on :08.12.2025

Ranjit Yadav

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. D.S. Virk, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present third petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 183 dated 01.07.2021, under Sections 18(b) and 27A of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Cheeka, District Kaithal.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, on the basis of secret information, petitioner was apprehended, and it was found that petitioner–Ranjit Yadav had tied some hard substance to his legs. After removing petitioner’s blue-coloured jeans, it was noticed that he had tied one transparent polythene bag on each leg, from which recovery was effected, and it was found that he was carrying 2 kg 830 gms of opium.



3. The prime argument of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. Without delving into the merits of the case, he submits that the petitioner has undergone more than four years and six months of custody. Counsel submits that out of a total of 19 prosecution witnesses, only 8 witnesses have been examined till date, and the completion of trial is likely to take considerable time. He further submits that the petitioner was earlier involved in one NDPS case wherein 500 gms of opium was allegedly recovered; the trial in that case is still pending, and petitioner has already been granted the concession of bail therein.

Thus, on the ground of the prolonged period of incarceration and the slow pace of trial, the petitioner prays for the grant of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner was found involved in the present case in which a commercial quantity was recovered from his possession, and he is also involved in another case, as pointed out by the petitioner's counsel. However, Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana, does not dispute the factual position and confirms the stage of trial as well as the custody period of the petitioner.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have carefully perused the paper book along with the documents appended thereto.

6. Considering the nature of the allegations, the fact that petitioner is in custody for period of last more than four years, and in view of the likelihood of protracted trial proceedings, this Court is of the



CRM-M-67876-2025

3

opinion that further detention of the petitioner would not serve any meaningful purpose. Consequently, present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

8. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioner is found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

08.12.2025
Rashmi

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