



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

213

CRM-M-21110-2026
Date of decision: 24.04.2026

RAJU TANWAR @ KRELIA

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

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

Present: - Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant fourth petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 240 dated 02.05.2021, registered under Section(s) 20C (27-A & 29 added later on) of the Narcotics Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station HTM, District Hisar, after the last one was withdrawn on 12.01.2026.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. He was initially arrested in the above case on 01.07.2021, however, he was granted regular bail vide order dated

22.09.2021. The petitioner could not appear before the trial Court on 30.11.2023 whereupon his bail was cancelled. He was later rearrested on 19.11.2024. The petitioner has remained in custody since then and he has undergone an actual custody of nearly 01 year and 05 months post his arrest. He further submits that despite the earlier petition having been withdrawn on 12.01.2026, the trial has not made any progress and only 02 witness have been examined during the interregnum period.

3. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the fact of the petitioner having been earlier granted concession of regular bail after custody of nearly 02 months and that he being in custody for nearly 01 year and 05 months after his re-arrest on account of his absence from the trial. The stage of the trial is also not disputed.

4. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith present petition.

5. Hence, without commenting on the merits of the case and taking into consideration that the petitioner has undergone a custody of 01 year and 05 months and that trial is progressing at a snail pace. I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

6. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/**heavy surety bond** to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. 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.
8. 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 24, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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