



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

Sr.No.238

**CRM-M-14093-2026
Decided on : 18.04.2026**

Tarun Sharma

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present : Mr. Ravikant Berwal, Advocate
for Mr. Baljeet Beniwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, Senior 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.616 dated 29.12.2025, registered under Section 20-61-85 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Mujessar, District Faridabad.

2. Brief facts of the present case as per the prosecution are that on 29.12.2025, SI Vinod along with his fellow police officials was on patrolling duty and on the basis of secret information, they apprehended the petitioner, who was found in conscious possession of 01 kg 220 grams *ganja*. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that the allegations levelled against him are false and he has no concern with the said offence. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 29.12.2025. The investigation



in the case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have been framed. Learned counsel further submits that out of 16 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. He further submits that 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.

Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate as well as status report. The same are taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. He has further submitted that the petitioner is also involved in multiple other cases of similar nature thereby he is a habitual offender.

11. 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 for the last more than 03 months and 20 days; the investigation in this case is complete; challan stands presented; charges have been framed and out of 16 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date and the fact that trial may take a long time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner in further custody. His further 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.

12. 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 his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution



CRM-M-14093-2026 3

of India and is against the principle “*bail is a rule*” and “*jail is an exception*”.

13. As regards the submission of learned State counsel that petitioner is involved in other/one more criminal case(s), reference is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (2) SCC 382*** in which, it is held that the facts and circumstances of the present case are to be seen while deciding a bail application and the bail application of the petitioner cannot be rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in other/another case(s). The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced herein-below:-

"As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

14. 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.

18.04.2026
mamta

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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