



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

215

**CRM-M-32450-2026
Date of Decision: 03.07.2026**

JONY HANS**... PETITIONER**

VERSUS

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

Present:- Mr. Harsh Vashistha, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed for grant of regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS (erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C) in case FIR No. 205 dated 21.06.2025 under Sections 20(b) (ii) (B), 29 of the NDPS Act and Section 111(2) (b) of BNS registered at Police Station Sector-5, Gurugram, Haryana.
2. The case of the prosecution is that the co-accused, namely Vikram @ Vicky, was apprehended and found to be in conscious possession of 501 grams of charas. During the course of the investigation, the petitioner was nominated as an accused solely on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the said co-accused and was consequently implicated in the present case.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been implicated solely on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the co-accused while in police custody, which is inadmissible in evidence. It is further submitted that no recovery has been effected from the conscious possession of the petitioner. It is further contended that the petitioner is in



custody since 24.07.2025 and prays for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and vehemently opposes the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is a habitual offender and has been involved in other cases. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in Court today, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner has been in custody for the last 11 months and 10 days.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 11 months and 10 days; 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 bonds, surety bonds to the



satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

10. Pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

03.07.2026

renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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