



CRM-M-22439-2026 (O&M)

-1-

(226) IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-22439-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 28.04.2026

Tashor @ Taso

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Kuldeep Singh Siwach, Advocate for
Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

The prayer in the present petition under Section 483 BNSS is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.215 dated 23.05.2025 registered under Sections 20(b) (ii) C and Section 29 added later on (Act No.61) of the NDPS Act, 1885 at Police Station Meham, District Rohtak.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner-Tashor @ Taso was apprehended with 1 Kg 70 Grams of Charas.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner has been in custody since 23.05.2025 but none out of the 20 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. Even otherwise, as the recovery from the petitioner was marginally above the commercial quantity of 01 Kg of charas, the petitioner is entitled to the grant of bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel contends that commercial quantity of contraband has been recovered from the petitioner.



CRM-M-22439-2026 (O&M)

-2-

Therefore, she is not entitled to the concession of bail in view of the bar contained under Section 37 of the NDPS Act. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is a first time offender, in custody since 23.05.2025 but none out of the 20 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. In the cases of 'Sukhchain Singh @ Manga Versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-7857-2022 decided on 04.04.2022, Pardeep Singh versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-46244-2022 decided on 19.01.2023, Hari Yadav @ Haiya versus State of Punjab (CRM-M-37645-2021)' decided on 11.11.2022, 'Jang Kanwar Versus State of Punjab (CRM-M-53415-2021)' decided on 19.01.2022, 'Shankar Prashad Chanau Versus The State of Punjab, CRM-M-24090-2020, decided on 27.08.2020, Gurpreet Kumar Versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-17021-2021, decided on 31.08.2021, Salim Versus State of Haryana, CRM-M-42436-2020, decided on 24.02.2021, Gagandeep Versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-3055-2021, decided on 27.01.2021, Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi Versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-41039-2019, decided on 26.02.2020, Dalbara Singh Versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-47880-2022 decided on 16.01.2023', and Vivek Watts versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-13791-2022 decided on 15.02.2023, where the recovery from the accused was marginally above the commercial quantity for the respective contraband in each case, the Court granted bail to the accused therein.

7. In the present case, the alleged recovery from the petitioner is of 01 Kg 70 Grams of charas, which is marginally above the commercial



CRM-M-22439-2026 (O&M)

-3-

quantity of 01 Kg. In this situation, the provisions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act can be relaxed to an extent and the case of the petitioner can be considered for the grant of bail, moreso, when she is in custody since 23.05.2025 but none out of the 20 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

8. Thus, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner, namely, Tashor @ Taso wife of Dharambir is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. The petitioner shall appear on the first Monday of every month before the police station concerned till the conclusion of the trial and furnish an affidavit each time that she is not involved in any other case other than the present case.

10. In addition, the petitioner (or someone on her behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from Trial without sufficient cause.

11. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

28.04.2026

vishal

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