

**CRM-M-16842-2026****1****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****215****CRM-M-16842-2026****Decided on :06.04.2026**

Sumit Sahran

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

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

Mr. Parveen Kumar, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

-:-

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS (corresponding Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking regular bail in case FIR No.149 dated 29.07.2024, under Sections 20(b) (ii) (c) of NDPS Act (Section 29 of NDPS Act and Section 238 of BNS (corresponding Section 201 of the Indian Penal Code added lateron in the final investigation report), registered at Police Station Lakhan Majra, District Rohtak, Haryana.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, upon receiving secret information regarding a black-coloured Scorpio vehicle and a Swift car bearing registration No. HR-12-AK-4037, police set up a barricade to check the vehicles. Shortly thereafter, both the aforesaid vehicles were seen approaching and were intercepted.

The occupant of the black-coloured Scorpio, bearing temporary registration No. T064 HR 1666 AS, disclosed his name as Ritu. However, driver of the Swift car fled from the spot, leaving the vehicle behind. It is further alleged that 47.200 kg of ganja was recovered from the rear portion of the black-coloured Scorpio.

**CRM-M-16842-2026****2**

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, as his involvement is alleged solely on the basis of the disclosure statement made by co-accused-Yogesh who has been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 12.02.2026 passed in CRM-M-37142-2025. Counsel further submits that that other co-accused, namely, Ritu and Loka Madhukhar, have also been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order of even date i.e. 06.04.2026. Counsel further submits that apart from the disclosure statement, no other evidence is presently available with the prosecution.

4. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner, aged 31 years, is in custody for a period of last 07 months and 09 days and has clean antecedents, with no other case registered against him. Counsel also submits that out of a total of 35 prosecution witnesses, only 06 have been examined till date; thus, trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Accordingly, prayer is made for the grant of regular bail.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the grant of bail and submits that though petitioner was not named in the FIR, record of telephonic conversations and contacts with the co-accused reveals his involvement in a conspiracy with the other accused in the present case. It is further submitted that, at the relevant point of time, petitioner's location was also found to be the same as that of the other accused. Thus, there exists a chain of connectivity linking the petitioner with the alleged offence, and he does not deserve the concession of bail.

**CRM-M-16842-2026****3**

6. Considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody for a period a period of last 07 months 09 months, coupled with the fact that co-accused has already been granted the concession of regular bail, and also taking into account that only a few prosecution witnesses have been examined and trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude, this Court is of the considered view that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in further custody.

Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

8. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioner is found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

06.04.2026***Rashmi***

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No