



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-22064-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.04.2026

Rasalu

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. R.K. Lathwal, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, DAG Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.27 dated 05.02.2025, registered under Section(s) 20(B)(ii)(C), 29 (added later on) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Baroda, District Sonipat.

2. Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that a secret information was received by the police officials to the effect that Ranbir @ Kala, son of Bakshi, along with Jogendra @ Joga, son of Surajmal and Rohit @ Sonu, son of Dharambir, were transporting a commercial quantity of charas from Safidon towards Jagsi on Gohana Road in a Ritz car bearing registration No. HR-42-7358. Acting upon the said information, the police

party laid a naka/blockade at the appropriate location. During the course of the naka, the aforesaid vehicle was intercepted and stopped. Upon search of the vehicle, a recovery of 1.115 kilograms of charas was effected from beneath the bonnet of the car.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the co-accused, namely Ranbir @ Kala, Joginder @ Joga and Rohit @ Sonu, during the course of investigation, nominated one Rajiya Khatoon and Mohd. Saif. It is submitted that co-accused Rajiya Khatoon was stated to be the person from whom the contraband had been procured and the name of the present petitioner surfaced only in her disclosure statement. It is further contended that the petitioner was arrested on 17.09.2025; however, no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from him or at his instance. Consequently, the disclosure statement remains uncorroborated by any independent or substantive evidence and, therefore, cannot be relied upon to attribute culpability or to establish any nexus of the petitioner with the alleged offence. It is submitted that the investigation in the present case is complete and a final report already stands filed. He submits that there are 34 prosecution witnesses but none of them has been examined so far, thus, the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects but submits that the petitioner has criminal antecedents. He is, however, is not in a position to refer to any evidence on the basis whereof it may be assumed that the petitioner had any contact with co-accused/Rajiya Khatoon. The period of custody undergone by the

petitioner as well as the stage of proceedings is also not denied.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as noted above, including that the arguable issued with respect to the culpable liability of the petitioner, the period of actual custody undergone by him, the absence of recovery from him, the stage of the trial and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness 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.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

27.04.2026

Mangal Singh

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