



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

Sr.No.226

**CRM-M-19840-2026
Decided on : 22.05.2026**

Sukhchain @ Sukhle

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present : Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

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.171 dated 13.09.2025, registered under Section 17 of the of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, at Police Station Dujana, District Jhajjar.

2. Brief facts, as per the prosecution case, are that on 13.09.2025, ASI Manoj Kumar, alongwith his fellow police officials was present on patrolling and on the basis of secret information, apprehended the petitioner, who was found in conscious possession of 141 grams of opium. 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. She further contends that the allegations levelled against him are false and he has no concern with the said offence. Learned counsel contends that mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act were not complied with at the time of alleged search and seizure. She further contends that the recovery of alleged contraband has already been effected from the petitioner and nothing more is recovered from him. Learned counsel contends that the recovered quantity is non-commercial in nature. The petitioner is in custody since 13.09.2025. The investigation in this case is complete; challan stands presented; charges have been framed and out of 15 prosecution witnesses, only 01 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 the petitioner behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Learned State counsel has filed the status report as well as custody certificate which 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 meaning thereby he is a habitual offender.

10. 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 08 months and 08 days; recovered contraband falls under intermediate quantity; the investigation in this case is complete; challan stands presented; charges have been framed; out of 15 prosecution witnesses, only 01 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 continued 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.

11. 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 of India and is against the principle "*bail is a rule*" and "*jail is an exception*".

12. 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."

13. 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.

22.05.2026
mamta

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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