



CRM-M-4060 of 2026

-1-

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

225

CRM-M-4060 of 2026
Date of Decision: 10.03.2026

Raj Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Kushager Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, DAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.245 dated 05.05.2025 registered under Sections 105, 123 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station Rania, District Sirsa.

2. Brief facts as per the case of the prosecution are that son of the complainant had died after consuming heroin, which was alleged sold to him by the petitioner along with other co-accused. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submitted that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR, nor has any concern with the said offence. It has also been contended that the petitioner

**CRM-M-4060 of 2026****-2-**

has been nominated as an accused only on the basis of the disclosure statement made by one co-accused Kamlesh Rani. Apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the offence in question and it is a trite law that disclosure statement of the co-accused during his custodial interrogation is not admissible. He argued that no specific allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. He further argued that it was the co-accused Joginder Singh and Jaswinder Singh who were last seen with the deceased. He further argued that there is no eye-witness in the present case. Further, co-accused Kamlesh Rani has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 18.02.2026. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. No recovery is to be effected from him. The petitioner is in custody since 24.09.2025. The investigation in the case is complete, challan also stands presented but charges are yet to be framed. He further submitted that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has already filed the status report in the matter and while referring to the same, she has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. However, she has not controverted the fact that the petitioner is a first time offender as he is not involved in any other case.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody



CRM-M-4060 of 2026

-3-

for the last more than 05 months; he has clean antecedents; investigation is complete; challan stands presented; charges are yet to be framed; the complicity of the petitioner is a matter of trial and the same will take a long time to conclude. Thus, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. His continued detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

6. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of her right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle "*bail is a rule*" and "*jail is an exception*".

7. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10.03.2026*D.Bansal***(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE**

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