



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

244

CRM-M-20834-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision : 23.04.2026

Tarif @Taju

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Aazam Khan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambauta, DAG Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

This petition for bail is the second petition, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.705 dated 12.11.2020, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 20 and 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, hereinafter being referred to as 'NDPS Act', Police Station City Ballabgarh, District Faridabad.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case was lodged on recovery of 08 kg of ganja from co-accused 'Riyaz' and 'Rizwan'. According to prosecution, when the above-named accused were arrested and interrogated, they suffered a disclosure statement, wherein they nominated one accused, namely 'Hemant @Baba', and on his



arrest, 'Hemant @Baba' suffered a disclosure statement, wherein he nominated the present petitioner, as the supplier of the abovementioned contraband.

3. **Notice of motion.**

4. Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambauta, DAG Haryana appears on behalf of respondent-State. Hence service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record. No formal reply has been filed by the State. However, the learned State Counsel has orally opposed the present petition.

5. Heard.

6. The record has been perused carefully.

7. The record shows that in the present case, the petitioner was arrested in May, 2021 and in July, 2021, he was accorded the benefit of bail. However, subsequently he jumped the bail and therefore, his bail was cancelled and bonds were forfeited to the State. It is reflected from the record that after the cancellation of bail, the petitioner was arrested on 06.08.2024 and since then, he is in custody.

8. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration for a decision: -

- i) that the petitioner after re-arrest has already suffered incarceration for a period of one year and ten months;



- ii) that the quantity of contraband, recovered from the possession of co-accused, comes within the ambit of ‘non-commercial quantity’, and therefore, rigors of Section-37 of NDPS Act are not applicable to the present case;
- iii) that only evidence collected by the Investigating Agency against the petitioner is the disclosure statement of his co-accused;
- iv) that nothing has been recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- v) that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vi) that the detention of the petitioner in judicial lockup is not likely to serve any purpose;
- vii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner may tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- viii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the trial.

9. In the present case, the principles of law laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in the case of “Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another”, 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131, are also relevant, wherein it has been observed that “a fundamental postulate of criminal jurisprudence is the presumption of innocence, meaning thereby that a person is believed to be innocent until found guilty. However, there are instances in our criminal law where a reverse onus has been placed on an accused with regard to some specific offences but that is another matter and does not detract from the fundamental postulate in respect of other offences. Yet another important facet of our criminal jurisprudence is that the grant of



bail is the general rule and putting a person in jail or in a prison or in a correction home (whichever expression one may wish to use) is an exception. Unfortunately, some of these basic principles appear to have been lost sight of with the result that more and more persons are being incarcerated and for longer periods. This does not do any good to our criminal jurisprudence or to our society. There is no doubt that the grant or denial of bail is entirely the discretion of the judge considering a case but even so, the exercise of judicial discretion has been circumscribed by a large number of decisions rendered by this Court and by every High Court in the country. Yet, occasionally there is a necessity to introspect whether denying bail to an accused person is the right thing to do on the facts and in the circumstances of a case”.

10. The principles laid down by the Hon’ble the Supreme Court of India in the case of ‘Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Another’, (2022) 10 SCC 51, are also relevant in this case. In the abovementioned case, it has been observed that “the rate of conviction in criminal cases in India is abysmally low. It appears to us that this factor weighs on the mind of the Court while deciding the bail applications in a negative sense. Courts tend to think that the possibility of a conviction being nearer to rarity, bail applications will have to be decided strictly, contrary to legal principles. We cannot mix up consideration of a bail application, which is not punitive in nature with that of a possible adjudication by way of trial. On the contrary, an ultimate acquittal with continued custody would be a case of grave injustice”.

14. Accordingly, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is hereby ***allowed***. The petitioner is hereby ordered to be released on bail on furnishing personal bond and surety bond(s) to the



satisfaction of learned trial Court. However the abovementioned concession shall be subject to following conditions:-

- (i) that the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade him to disclose such facts to the Court or to any other authority;
- (ii) that the petitioner shall at the time of execution of bond, furnish the address to the Court concerned and shall notify the change in address to the trial Court, till the final decision of the trial; and
- (iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without prior permission of the trial Court.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

23.04.2026

Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No