



CRM-M-16348-2026

-1-

**117 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-16348-2026

Date of decision: 06.04.2026

Jaipal @ Happy

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Rajesh Kumar Kashyap, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in
case bearing FIR No.164 dated 07.08.2025, under Section(s) 18(b), 29, 61 and
85 of NDPS Act registered at Police Station Ismailabad, District Kurukshetra.

2 Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the above-said
FIR was registered on the basis of secret information to the effect that one
Shivgan @ Balli and Jaswinder @ Sammi had been indulging in the business
of narcotics and that in the event they were apprehended, contraband could be
recovered from them. A blockade was accordingly set up by the police and
above-said persons were apprehended. On carrying out their search, 2.660 kgs
of opium was recovered from the said accused.

3. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been nominated as
an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Shivgan @ Balli
to the effect that payments to Mahesh were being made through the account



(of his niece Sarabjit Kaur) in which cash was deposited by various persons including the petitioner herein. Learned counsel further contends that solitary role attributed to the petitioner is of having made some cash deposit into the account of his niece. He contends that there can be no presumption drawn against the petitioner that the said amount was deposited for the purposes of narcotic trade. The petitioner has no criminal antecedents and has been nominated as an accused solely because Shivgan @ Balli is his brother. It is also submitted that similarly situated co-accused, who were nominated as accused on the basis of disclosure statement, have already been granted bail by this Court.

4. On the other hand, State counsel does not dispute the above-said contentions.

5. Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, absence of recovery from him, the period of custody undergone as well as clean antecedents, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

6. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, 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.



CRM-M-16348-2026

-3-

8. The observation made hereinabove 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.

06.04.2026
sonia

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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