

2026:PHHC:065796



228

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-22691-2026

Parkash @ Bhagta @ Langra

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

Date of Decision: April 29, 2026

Date of Uploading: April 29, 2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. Anshumaan Dalal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, in case bearing FIR No.25 dated 14.02.2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 20(b)(ii)(c) and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short 'NDPS Act'), at Police Station Lakhan Majra, Rohtak, District Rohtak.

2. The gravamen of the FIR in question is that the petitioner is an accused of being involved in an FIR pertaining to NDPS Act involving alleged recovery of 1 kilogram 403 gram *charas* from co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Vikram, and the same co-accused, on the basis of his disclosure, nominated the present petitioner in this case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the petitioner is in custody since 27.09.2025. Learned counsel has further submitted that mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act have not scrupulously been complied with, and thus, the prosecution case suffers from inherent defects. Learned counsel has urged that the sole basis to array the petitioner as an accused is the disclosure statement of co-accused, namely, Vikram, from whom the alleged contraband was recovered, and the said disclosure is not tenable in law. Learned counsel has submitted that even said co-accused, namely, Vikram has been granted concession of regular bail, vide order dated **20.04.2026** passed by this Court in **CRM-M-16716-2026**. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner has suffered incarceration for more than 07 months. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and, thus, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel has further submitted that the instant bail plea is barred by the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act, and thus, the same ought to be dismissed. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 28.04.2026, in the Court today, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner is in custody since 27.09.2025, whereinafter investigation was carried out and challan *qua* the petitioner was presented on 27.03.2026. Total 25 prosecution witnesses have been cited, out of which, none has been examined till date. The petitioner has been implicated as an accused in the FIR in question solely on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused –

Vikram from whom the contraband in question was recovered, and said co-accused has been afforded concession of regular bail by this Court. As per prosecution version, there is no other material available to connect the petitioner with the contraband except for the said disclosure statement. It is pertinent to note that such disclosure statements, in the absence of corroborative evidence hold limited evidentiary value and cannot be sole basis for implicating the petitioner. The reliance on this unsubstantiated statement raises serious doubts about the fairness and objectivity of the investigation. It is not in dispute that the petitioner was not present at the spot. The veracity and weightage required to be attached to the disclosure statement made by the co-accused will be fully tested at the time of trial. The rival contentions raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues, which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1. At this juncture, it would be apposite to refer to a judgment passed by this Court in *Anshul Sardana versus State of Punjab*, passed in **CRM-M-65094-2024** (2025: PHHC:004198), wherein, after relying upon the *ratio decidendi* of the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Tofan Singh versus State of Tamil Nadu, AIR 2020 Supreme Court 5592; Smt. Najmunisha, Abdul Hamid Chandmiya @ Ladoo Bapu versus State of Gujrat, Narcotics Control Bureau, 2024 INSC 290; State by (NCB) Bengaluru vs. Pallulabid Ahmad Arimutta & Anr.', 2022 (1) RCR (Criminal) 762; and Vijay Singh vs. The State of Haryana, bearing Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No.(s) 1266/2023, decided on 17.05.2023, has held thus:

“6.3 *It is a well established principle of law that a confession made by a co-accused under Section 67 of the NDPS Act is inherently a very weak piece of evidence. Such statement(s), by themselves, cannot form the sole basis for the conviction of an individual and must be scrutinized with utmost caution in conjunction with other substantive evidence. Moreover, no recovery has been effected from the possession of the petitioner, who has been subsequently implicated as an accused solely on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused. However, as regular bail pertains to life and liberty of individual, Courts are obligated to strike a balance between safeguarding personal liberty and ensuring the effective administration of justice as also investigation. The final evidentiary value and admissibility of the disclosure statement made by a co-accused fall within the domain of the trial Court and are to be adjudicated during the course of the trial in accordance with established principles of law. However, while adjudicating a plea for regular bail, this Court cannot remain oblivious to the circumstances under which the petitioner has been arraigned or implicated, including the nature of the allegations, the evidence linking the petitioner to the offence as well as the specific role attributed to the petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence. A prima facie examination of these factors is essential to ensure that the process of law is not misused, abused or misdirected.*”

6.2. As per custody certificate dated 28.04.2026 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 07 months and 01 day.

6.3. Further, as per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in other FIR(s). However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586***, a Division Bench judgment of the Hon’ble Calcutta High Court in case of ***Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477*** & judgments of this Court in CRM-M No.38822-2022 titled as ***Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana***, decided on 29.11.2021, and ***Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191***.

In this view of the matter, the rigor imposed under Section 37 of the NDPS Act stands diluted in light of the Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, if not required in any other case, on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cellphone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.
- (viii) The petitioner shall submit, on the first working day of every month, an affidavit, before the concerned trial Court, to the effect that he has not been involved in commission of any offence after being released on bail. In case the petitioner is found to be involved in any offence after his being enlarged on bail in the present FIR, on the basis of his affidavit or otherwise, the State is mandated to move, forthwith, for cancellation of his bail which plea, but of course, shall be ratiocinated upon merits thereof.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate as directed

hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

- 9. Ordered accordingly.
- 10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
- 11. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

April 29, 2026
mahavir

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