



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

**CRM-M-23272-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision : 01.05.2026**

Paramjeet @ Pamma

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

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

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Senior DAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.253 dated 19.10.2025, under Sections 21(b) and Section 27-A added later on of the NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station City Ratia, District Fatehabad.
2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that on 19.10.2025, when the police party in connection with checking of suspicious substance reached at the distance of 100 meter from Sardulgarh Road, two youths while riding on motorcycle were seen coming from the opposite side from Rattakher side. They were stopped. On asking, the rider of the motorcycle disclosed his name as Manjeet Singh and the pillion rider disclosed his name as Kulwinder Singh @ Pardeep. They were suspected to be carrying some contraband. Hence, their search was conducted. On conducting the search of Manjeet Singh, nothing was recovered from him, however, from Kulwinder Singh @ Pardeep, one plastic transparent pouch containing heroin was recovered from the right pocket of his trousers/jeans. On weighing, the same was found to be 5.015 grams along with polythene pouch. Thus, the FIR was registered and investigation commenced. During investigation, co-accused namely,



Manjeet Singh and Kulwinder Singh @ Pardeep disclosed that they both brought this heroin from Paramjeet @ Pamma (present petitioner) by purchasing it to further sale it to other person, hence, petitioner was arrayed as accused in the present case and was arrested on 23.12.2025. Petitioner approached the Court of learned Special Judge, Fast Track under NDPS Act, Fatehabad praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 03.04.2026. Hence, being aggrieved, petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused. He has submitted that the disclosure statement is not even an admissible evidence. He has contended that even otherwise, the alleged recovered quantity from the co-accused is 5.15 grams of Heroin whereas, the quantity upto 05 grams is small quantity. He has submitted that though the petitioner is involved in 03 other cases, however, he is on bail in the same. He, thus, has prayed that the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender as he is involved in 03 more cases. She, on instructions, has submitted that charges have been framed and out of 15 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far. She has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused on the basis

of disclosure statement of co-accused from whom recovery of 5.15 grams of Heroin was effected. There is no gainsaying that as per the mandate of the Act, the small quantity of Heroin is less than 05 grams whereas in the present case, the recovery is 5.15 grams which would be marginally above the small quantity. Custody certificate filed by the State shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 04 months and 09 days as on 01.05.2026. It further reflects that though the petitioner is involved in 03 more cases, however, in 01 case, he is on bail. As submitted, out of 15 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

7. If the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

01.05.2026
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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