

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

114+221

2026.PHHC.060287



CRM-M-20187-2026 (O&M).
Date of decision: 21.04.2026.

NASIR HUSSAIN @ NASIR @ MANTRI

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

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

PRESENT Mr. Saurav Bhatia, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Paras Talwar, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-16962-2026

Application is allowed as prayed for subject to all just exceptions.

Annexures P-3 to P-6 are taken on record.

The Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

Main case

This is the first petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in
case bearing FIR No.100 dated 01.09.2025, under Section(s) 21-C, 61 and 85
of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, (Section 29 of

the NDPS Act, added later on), registered at Police Station Ferozepur Jhirka, District Nuh (Mewat).

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s) contends that FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of secret information received to the effect that one person namely Alijan son of Mohd. Ismail is indulged into the business of selling heroin. Pursuant to said information co-accused Alijan son of Mohd. Ismail was arrested and 307.25 grams heroin was recovered from his conscious possession resulting in registration of the present FIR. Counsel contends that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement made by said co-accused Alijan. He further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 27.10.2025 and no recovery of any narcotic or psychotropic substances was effected from the petitioner. Moreover, the petitioner is not involved in any other case under the NDPS Act. It is submitted that investigation in the present case is complete and challan has been filed on 25.02.2026, however, the charges have not been framed yet, and there are total 21 witnesses cited by the prosecution, hence, conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time.

State counsel, on the other hand, does not dispute the facts noticed above i.e. custody period already undergone by the petitioner and that no recovery was effected from him.

Having heard the counsel for the respective parties and without commenting anything on the merits of the present case and further taking into consideration the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, the nature of the allegations levelled against him, his non-involvement in any other case under the NDPS Act as well as absence of recovery of any recovery nature whatsoever from him, I deem it appropriate to allow the present

petition. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. 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.

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.

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.

April 21, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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