



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

208

**CRM-M No.32282 of 2026
Date of decision : 3.7.2026
Date of uploading : 3.7.2026**

Tarsem Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Abhishek Rana, Advocate, for the petitioner

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, 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.99 dated 17.4.2026 under Sections 15(b) of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Pinjore, District Panchkula (now the petitioner is confined in Central Jail, Ambala).
2. The gravamen of the FIR in question is that the petitioner is an accused of being involved in FIR pertaining to NDPS Act involving 8 Kg. 235 grams of poppy straw (*chura post*) allegedly recovered from a truck, which was being driven by Jaspal Singh; and co-accused Tarsem Singh was seated on the conductor seat, on 17.4.2026 in the area of village Prempura.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 17.4.2026. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further urged that the main accused namely Jaspal Singh, who was owner of the truck, from wherein the recovery has been made, has been granted the concession of regular bail by the concerned Sessions Court. Learned counsel has further submitted that, assuming *arguendo*, the prosecution version is taken to be correct, the petitioner is merely working as a Cleaner on the truck and even not aware whether any contraband was actually in the truck in question. Learned counsel has further submitted that, assuming *arguendo*, the prosecution version is taken to be correct, the petitioner is accused of involving in a case pertaining to recovery of 8 Kg. 235 grams of poppy straw, which is non-commercial in nature and thus, urged that the provisions of Section 37 of NDPS Act would not apply. Hence, 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 seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 1.7.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 17.4.2026 wherein after investigation was carried out; challan was prepared on 15.6.2026 and



subsequently filed. Total 17 prosecution witnesses have been cited but none has been examined till date. It is also not in dispute that co-accused namely Jaspal Singh, owner of the truck in question from wherein the contraband was recovered, stands enlarged on bail by the concerned Sessions Court. It is, thus, indubitable that culmination of trial will take its own time. 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.

6.1 As per custody certificate dated 1.7.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 2 months and 9 days. As per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in 2 other 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.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail 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/Illaq 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.



8. 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.
9. Ordered accordingly.
10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

3.7.2026
Ashwanii

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