

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

235

CRM-M-23621-2026

Date of decision : 04.05.2026

Date of uploading:04.05.2026

Paramjeet @ Pamma

.....Petitioner

Versus

State Of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

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


Ms. Priyanka Sadar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. 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 FIR No.258 dated 29.10.2025, under Section 21(b) and Section 27-A of NDPS Act added later on, registered at Police Station City Ratia, District Fatehabad.

2. The gravamen of the allegations against the petitioner is that the petitioner is an accused of being involving in an FIR pertaining to NDPS Act involving alleged recovery of 5.25 grams of heroin from the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the petitioner is in custody since 18.12.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the FIR in question, primarily on account of his antecedents. Learned counsel has further submitted that the contraband recovered in connection with the FIR in question is 5.25




grams of heroin, which is non-commercial in nature, and that the petitioner has been implicated primarily on the basis of a disclosure statement. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel has further urged that the petitioner is already facing other FIR(s) under the NDPS Act and is a habitual offender. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 30.04.2026 in Court, 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 was arrested on 18.12.2025 wherein after investigation was carried out and challan already stands presented on 24.12.2025. Total 13 prosecution witnesses have been cited but only 2 have been examined till date. It is not in dispute that the contraband allegedly recovered into the FIR in question is 5.25 grams of heroin, which is non-commercial quantity and, thus, the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act would not apply in this case. Further, the weightage to be attached to the fact that the petitioner has been implicated in the FIR in question primarily on the basis of a disclosure statement shall be gone into during the course 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.

7. As per the custody certificate dated 30.04.2026 the petitioner has already undergone a total custody period of 4 months and 12 days & is shown to be involved in other case. As per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in more cases/FIRs. Indubitably, the antecedents of a person are required to be accounted for while considering a regular bail petition preferred by him. 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*.

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

8. 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 CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/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 cell-phone 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/Illaqqa 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.

9. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/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.

10. Ordered accordingly.

11. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

12 Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

04.05.2026
jatin

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