



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

CRM-M-6931-2026

Date of Decision: 29.04.2026

Ashok Kumar @ Ajay

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Rakesh Kumar Lathwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, DAG, Haryana.

Vinod S. Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS for seeking regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.236 dated 12.8.2025, registered under Section 22(C) of NDPS Act, 1985 (Section 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 added later on), at Police Station Sector 27, District Sonipat.

2. The FIR in the present case has been registered on receipt of secret information to the effect that one Devender son of Om Prakash is engaged in dealing with medicines prohibited by the Government and that he was coming towards FIMS Hospital, Supermax Society while carrying banned medicines. On receipt of the said information, surveillance was maintained and said Devender son of Om Prakash was apprehended by the Police. From his possession, 97 bottles of Codeine Phosphate &



Chlorpheniramine Maleate syrup were recovered.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that petitioner was nominated as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement made by said co-accused Devender. He further contends that despite the petitioner having been taken in custody on 14.08.2025, there is no recovery of any nature whatsoever from his possession or at the instance of the petitioner. He has clean antecedents and is not involved in any other criminal case. It is further contended that there is also no evidence on record on the basis of which the relationship of said Devender with the petitioner could be established.

4. Learned State counsel does not dispute the abovesaid facts. It is also not disputed that out of 16 witnesses cited by the prosecution, only one has been examined so far.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, but taking into consideration the fact that petitioner has been nominated on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, that no recovery has been made at the instance of the petitioner herein, also noticing that apart from the aforesaid disclosure and confession of the petitioner, there is no other evidence which is currently referred to by the prosecution to establish the link of the petitioner in the commission of the offence, the clean antecedents as well as the period of custody of the petitioner and also the fact that out of 16 prosecution witness, only one has been examined so far hence, conclusion



of trial will take a long time, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. Anything observed here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

29.04.2026
SN

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No