



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

217

CRM-M No.11820 of 2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 01.04.2026

Ashish @ Tidda

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Vishal Jassal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG, Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

This is second petition for bail, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the 'Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023'. This petition pertains to a case arising out of FIR No.126 dated 13.05.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 21/29-61-85 of Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, Police Station Mullana, District Ambala.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'PSI Vinod Kumar'. It was reported by the above named police officer that on 13.05.2025 when he was leading a team of police officials, deputed for patrolling duty, near Kalpi cut he received a tip-off from a reliable source that 'Krish @ Kali', 'Ajay Kumar', 'Vikas' and 'Sushil' were jointly involved in the trading of narcotic substance,



and that on that day they all would be travelling in an Ertiga car bearing registration HR-37-F-9684 from Mullana to Ambala. As per above named police officer in view of above mentioned information the above mentioned car was intercepted and from the occupants of abovesaid car 380 grams of 'Heroin' was recovered, i.e. from the possession of accused 'Krish' 380 grams, from 'Ajay' 40 grams and from 'Vikas' 40 grams.

3. As per prosecution on recovery of above mentioned contraband, requisite formalities with regard to seizure and sealing of contraband, slapping of FIR and formal arrest of the petitioner were completed and further investigation taken-up. According to prosecution during the course of investigation when accused namely 'Krish' was interrogated he suffered a disclosure statement wherein he nominated the present petitioner as an accused, by stating that Rs.75,000/ was paid by the petitioner to 'Krish' for the purchase of above mentioned contraband.

4. **Notice of motion.**

5. Since advance notice has already been served upon the State, Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG, Haryana, has appeared on behalf of respondent-State. Hence, service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record. No formal reply has been filed by the State. However, the learned State counsel has orally opposed the present petition.

6. **Heard.**

7. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that petitioner is



innocent who has been falsely implicated in the present case, merely, on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused. According to learned counsel for the petitioner no evidence against the petitioner has been collected by the investigating agency, and therefore, the petitioner who has already suffered incarceration for a period of more than nine and half months, is entitled for the benefit of bail. It has also been contented by learned counsel for the petitioner that on the last four occasions when the case was listed before the learned trial Court no progress took place in the trial, and that except three cases i.e. one under NDPS Act, one under Arms Act and one under Excise Act, there is no other case pending against the petitioner.

8. The above mentioned arguments have been controverted by the learned State counsel. It has been contented by the learned State counsel that this is the second bail petition filed by the petitioner, and that from the date of dismissal of former bail petition no significant change in circumstances has taken place.

9. The record has been perused carefully.

10. A perusal of the record shows that former bail petition filed by the petitioner was dismissed on 05.12.2025, i.e. barely four months ago, and from the date of dismissal of former bail petition no significant change in circumstance has taken place. Otherwise also, this fact cannot be ignored that the quantity/recovered contraband from the possession of co-accused comes within the ambit of commercial quantity and the total period of the incarceration, of the petitioner, does not lead to an interference that there is



delay in trial.

11. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the above mentioned factors, it is hereby observed that the present petition is devoid of merits and deserves dismissal. Hence the same is hereby dismissed accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

01.04.2026
Manoj Bhutani

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