



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

235

CRM-M-22032-2026

Date of decision: 27th April, 2026

Tejpal @ Teja

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

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

Mr. Vishal Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 168 dated 16.04.2024 registered under Section 20 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, '*NDPS Act*') and Section 120-B of IPC at Police Station Chand Hut, District Palwal.

2. As per the allegations, on 16.04.2024, accused Pawan and Satish @ Mintu were apprehended while they were going in a car bearing registration No. UP-16-FT-4245 and recovery of 148 kgs and 460 grams of *ganja* was effected from the said car. They were formally arrested. On interrogation, they

2026:PHHC:064063



suffered disclosure statements, on the basis of which the present petitioner and other co-accused were nominated. The allegations against the petitioner are that he along with the co-accused Satish had procured the recovered contraband from accused Jatinder. The petitioner was arrested on 08.07.2025. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner was not found at the spot and has been involved in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the co-accused, which is not admissible in evidence. To fortify this argument, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the authority of Hon'ble Supreme Court rendered in ***Tofan Singh vs. State of Tamil Nadu : (2021) 4 SCC 1***. It is further argued no recovery whatsoever, has been effected from the petitioner subsequent to his arrest. Although, the petitioner has been falsely implicated in one more case of similar nature but he is on bail in that case. The petitioner is in custody since 08.07.2025. Investigation has since been completed and *challan* has been presented. The trial is likely to take time to conclude. Similarly situated co-accused Doulat @ Doulat Ram and Jitender Pradhan @ Jietndra Pradhan have already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court. On parity, he too deserves to be released on bail. No useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. It is submitted therein and learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner is

2026:PHHC:064063



not entitled to get benefit of bail as there are serious allegations against him. Though he was nominated in this case on the basis of the disclosure suffered by the co-accused but during the course of investigation, his involvement in the subject crime was established. The allegation against petitioner is that he had supplied the contraband to the co-accused. Trial may be expedited. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner has been nominated in this case on the basis of the disclosure made by co-accused Satish @ Mintu and Pawan. Subsequent to his arrest, no recovery has been effected from him. Similarly situated co-accused Doulat @ Doulat Ram and Jitender Pradhan @ Jietndra Pradhan have already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court, as mentioned above. The petitioner is shown to be involved in one more case under the provisions of NDPS Act and three cases under Section 379 of IPC. His involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be a ground for denying benefit of bail to him. A perusal of the status report reveals that there are total 16 prosecution witnesses but none has been examined so far, which means that the conclusion of trial is likely to take time. The petitioner is in custody since 08.07.2025. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his

2026:PHHC:064063



furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it will be open for the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail in case the petitioner is found involved in any other subsequent case.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

27th April, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |