



CRM-M-25484-2026

-1-

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

217

**CRM-M-25484-2026
Date of Decision: 12.05.2026**

AJAY @ GANJA**... PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA**... RESPONDENT****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present:- Mr. Suresh Nain, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under section 483 B.N.S.S. (earlier 439 Cr.P.C.) for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 690 dated 11.09.2025 under Section 21(b) of the NDPS Act registered at Police Station- Azad Nagar Hisar Haryana.
2. The case of the prosecution is that accused namely Naveen and Sandeep were apprehended by the police party on the basis of secret information on 11.09.2025 and were found in possession of heroin weighing 8.83 gm. During investigation, disclosure statements of the co-accused were recorded, wherein they alleged that the recovered contraband was procured from the present petitioner.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR and has been nominated solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused, which is not admissible in evidence against



him. He further submits that nothing has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. It is further submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 19.11.2025 and prays for grant of regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Ms. Malvika Singh, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent–State and has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail on the ground that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. She has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court today, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner has been in custody for the last 06 months and 01 day and is involved in 24 cases.

6. I have heard the submissions made by the parties and gone through the record.

7. After hearing the rival contentions and considering the fact that in the case in hand, the petitioner is in custody for the last 06 months and 01 day; that apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other substantive evidence to connect the petitioner with the recovery effected from the co-accused coupled with the fact that the trial is likely to take considerable time, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose would be served by further incarceration of the petitioner. Accordingly, the petitioner is granted the concession of regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.



9. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
10. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulged in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

12.05.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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