



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

CRM-M-27469-2026

Date of Decision: 26.05.2026

Aryan

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : **Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**

Present : Mr. Rakesh Kumar Lathwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Parmod Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.182, dated 11.07.2024, registered under Section 22 of N.D.P.S Act, 1985 (Final report submit under Sections 22-C, 29 of NDPS Act), at Police Station PGIMS-Rohtak, District Rohtak, Haryana.

2. As per the allegations, on 11.07.2024, on receipt of a secret information to the effect that the petitioner along with co-accused Mohit had indulged in the sale of prohibited medicines, namely, Onerex and on that very day also, they had brought such medicines from Delhi and were to sell the same in the area of Rohtak, a barricade was laid. The petitioner and co-accused were apprehended when they came in a swift car. On conducting their search, 11 bottles containing label Onerex TM were recovered from their conscious possession. They failed to show any valid license or permit for possessing the same. The recovered bottles were taken into possession by the police, the petitioner and co-accused were formally arrested. On the basis of disclosure statements of the petitioner and co-accused, one Shambhu Kumar was nominated as such. Investigation now stand completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of a secret information. A false recovery has been planted upon him. He is in custody for a period of about 01 year and 10 months. The trial will take considerable time to conclude as none out of 23 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. His continued detention would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner and the fact that commercial quantity of Onerex cough syrup containing Codeine was recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

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

6. In the present case, it is not in dispute that Mohit, co-accused, who is similarly placed has already been admitted to bail by this Court vide order dated 06.05.2026 in CRM-M-16370-2026 (Annexure P-2). Consequently, on parity, the present petition deserves to be allowed by this Court.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to furnishing his bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

26.05.2026
hitesh

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