



104

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-20734-2025
DECIDED ON: 23.03.2026

RAJVEER.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Ms. Vaishali Kamboj, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Rajveer, aged about 42 years	384	30.12.2024	20 of the NDPS Act, (Section 27-A added later on)	Dadri Sadar	Charkhi Dadri

2. After hearing the submissions addressed by counsel for the petitioner, on 22.04.2025, following order was passed:-

“2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that recovery in the present case



pertains to 204 grams of charas from the possession of the accused, namely, Pardeep @ Mahal. It is only thereafter that the name of the petitioner has been implicated in the case on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the said accused.

3. *It is further submitted that the petitioner's name does not find mention in the FIR and has been subsequently introduced into the investigation, allegedly due to the fact that he was already known to the police officials. Thus, prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.*

4. *Notice of motion*

5. *On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and submits that in fact, there is connecting evidence in the form of telephonic communication between the petitioner and the main accused namely Pardeep @ Mahal. Thus, he seeks some time to file a status report in the matter.*

6. *Adjourned to 13.05.2025, to enable learned State counsel to file status report in the matter.”*

3. As per the allegations, recovery in the present case pertains to 204 grams of *charas* from the possession of the accused, namely, Pardeep @ Mahal. It is only thereafter that name of the petitioner has been implicated in the case on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the said accused.

4. Learned State counsel submits that petitioner allegedly sold the recovered *charas* to co-accused Pardeep @ Mahal, and call detail records indicate that petitioner remained in regular telephonic contact with the said co-accused from 22.12.2024 to 30.12.2024.

5. However, upon being queried by the Court, learned State counsel was unable to clarify whether the main accused Pardeep @ Mahal, was also in contact with any other persons during the said period,



or why the present petitioner alone has been singled out as an accused primarily on the basis of telephonic conversations with the main accused.

6. Nevertheless, without expressing any opinion on this aspect, the matter is left to learned trial Court to determine whether, in fact, it was the petitioner who supplied the recovered *charas* to co-accused Pardeep @ Mahal.

Furthermore, it is not in dispute that reliance placed solely on the disclosure statement of a co-accused requires corroboration through independent and reliable evidence.

7. Considering the nature of allegations against the petitioner, and requirement of substantive evidence to establish the facts disclosed in the statement of the co-accused, this Court does not find any special reason to subject the petitioner for custodial interrogation.

8. **Accordingly, present petition is disposed of**, by directing the petitioner to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

9. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.



It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

10. With the directions issued here above, present petition stands disposed of.

23.03.2026
Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>