



CRM-M-27826-2025

- 1 -

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

229

CRM-M-27826-2025
Date of decision: 12.01.2026

RANJEET ALIAS BUCH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Shivansh Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Vasundhara Dalal Anand, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR. J.(Oral)

1. Present petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.313 dated 14.09.2024, under Section 18 of NDPS Act (offences under Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on), registered at Police Station IMT, District Rohtak.
2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 13.09.2024, ASI Rohtash, along with other police officials, was on patrolling duty when he received secret information that Ranjeet @ Buch and Deepak had gone to Nepal to procure opium. It was further informed that while returning in Ranjeet's Swift car bearing registration No. DL-8C-AS-2831, the vehicle had met with an accident and that, if a barrier was immediately set up on Sonapat Road, huge quantity of contraband could be recovered. After completing the necessary formalities, a barrier was laid. ASI Rohtash, with the assistance of other police officials, stopped and checked the said vehicle. Upon inquiry, the accused disclosed their names as Ranjeet @ Buch and Deepak. Upon search, 3.195 kg of opium was



CRM-M-27826-2025

- 2-

recovered from the possession of the accused persons. The contraband was taken into possession. The petitioner was arrested, and after completion of the investigation, the challan was presented against the accused for trial.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. Learned counsel next contended that the petitioner is in custody since 14.09.2024 and after completion of investigation, challan has been presented. Thereafter, charges have been framed and out of total 24 prosecution witnesses, only 04 have been examined till date. The case is still at the stage of prosecution evidence and trial has not been concluded and conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time. Learned counsel further contended that in view of his long incarceration, petitioner is entitled to be released on bail, as prolonged incarceration, generally militates against the most precious fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution and the conditional liberty must override the statutory embargo created under Section 37 of the NDPS Act. In support of his contention, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon judgments passed in CRM-M-21794 of 2023 – **Sandeep Singh v. State of Punjab** decided on 05.05.2023, CRR-1785 of 2018 (O&M)- **Vicky Kaur v. State of Punjab**, decided on 13.08.2018, CRM-M-14029 of 2018 **Kamlesh v. State of Punjab**, decided on 06.05.2015, CRM-M-17321 of 2025 **Jassu Ram @ Jasuram v. State of Punjab**, decided on 04.04.2025 and a judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No. (s).12788/2023 – **Nandalal Mondal @ Abhay Mondal v. The State of West Bengal**, judgment of Hon'ble Supreme

**CRM-M-27826-2025**

- 3-

Court passed in Criminal Appeal No.4883/2025 - **Santosh Pawar Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Anr.** decided on 14.11.2025 and (2022) 10 SCC 52, **Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation.**

5. On the other hand, learned State Counsel has opposed the bail and argued that the petitioner has committed a heinous crime as he was found in possession of 3.195 kg of opium and in view of rigors contained in statutory provision of Section 37 of NDPS Act, he is not entitled to the benefit of bail.

6. Hon'ble Supreme Court in 2023 Live Law (SC) 533, **Rabi Prakash v. State of Odisha** has held that prolonged incarceration, generally militates against the most precious fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution and in such a situation, the conditional liberty must override the statutory embargo created under Section 37 of the NDPS Act. To the same effect is the law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in 2024 (4) RCR (Criminal) 172, **Ankur Chaudhary v. State of Madhya Pradesh** 2023 AIR(SC) 1648, **Mohammad Muslim alias Hussain v. State (NCT of Delhi)** in which Hon'ble Supreme Court while granting regular bail to an accused, from whom commercial quantity of contraband was recovered, has held that grant of bail on the ground of undue delay in trial cannot be said to be fettered by Section 37 of the NDPS Act. A co-ordinate Bench of this Court has also held so in judgment reported as Law Finder Doc Id #2770222 **Garpawandeep Singh alias Bihari v. State of Punjab** decided vide judgment dated 27.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-19408 of 2025 wherein 260 grams of heroin was allegedly recovered. Hon'ble Supreme Court in Special Leave to Appeal (Criminal) No.12788/2023 titled **Nandalal Mondal alias Abhay Mondal v. The State of West Bengal**, vide judgment dated 03.01.2024



CRM-M-27826-2025

- 4 -

while taking into consideration the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner/under- trial, the fact that he does not have any criminal antecedents and also keeping in view the prolonged incarceration, ordered release of the petitioner on bail who was found in possession of 10,000 ml of codeine phosphate - a cough syrup which falls within the commercial quantity. Hon'ble Supreme Court in Criminal Appeal No.4883/2025 titled **Santosh Pawar Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Anr. (supra)**, has held that appellant who was being prosecuted for being in possession of commercial quantity of narcotic substance was entitled for bail in view of her incarceration for a period of 19 months. In **Satender Kumar Antil's case (supra)**, prolonged incarceration and inordinate delay engaged the attention of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, which considered the correct approach towards bail, with respect to several enactments, including Section 37 of NDPS Act. The Court expressed the opinion that Section 436A of Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (which requires inter alia the accused to be enlarged on bail if the trial is not concluded within specified periods) would apply.

7. In the present case also, petitioner was found in possession of 3.195 kg of opium which falls within commercial quantity. Petitioner is in custody since 14.09.2024 and after completion of investigation, challan has been presented. Thereafter, charges have been framed and out of total 24 prosecution witnesses, only 04 have been examined till date but the trial has not been concluded till date and there is also no likelihood of the same being concluded soon. As such, the conditional liberty must override the statutory embargo created under Section 37 of the NDPS Act and grant of bail on the ground of undue delay in trial cannot be said to be fettered by Section 37 of the NDPS Act. Therefore, taking into



CRM-M-27826-2025

- 5-

consideration the facts and circumstances of the present case and also the ratio of law laid down in afore-mentioned case laws, I am of the opinion that no useful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner in custody and resultantly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bond and surety bond to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions. However, in addition to the terms and conditions that may be imposed by the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) Petitioner shall not misuse the concession of bail granted to him.
- (ii) Petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary during the trial.
- (iii) Petitioner shall regularly appear before the trial Court and he will not commit any offence of similar nature while on bail.
- (iv) Petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (v) Petitioner shall not in any manner delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions or the conditions that may be imposed by the trial Court or upon any other sufficient cause, the State shall be at liberty to apply for cancellation of bail.

12.01.2026

Vishal Vardhan

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No