



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

**CRM-M No.31305 of 2026
Date of Decision:-23.06.2026**

Amandeep Singh

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. Inderjeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG, Haryana.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition preferred under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short the "BNSS") is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.728 dated 06.11.2025 registered under Sections 21(C) and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short the "NDPS Act") and Section 111(2)(ii) of the BNS, 2023 (added later on) at Police Station City Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. On 06.11.2025, on the basis of a secret information, Sartaj and Nahim were apprehended by a police party and 1.103 Kgs. of heroin was recovered. In their disclosure statements, said Sartaj and Nahim named Mustafa and Ankit Sharma. Both persons were also arrested and Ankit Sharma, in his disclosure statement, named the present petitioner and

certain other persons. It was stated that the petitioner used to purchase small quantities of contraband from him for its further sale. Accordingly, the petitioner was arrested on 03.01.2026 and is in custody since then.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. He submits that no recovery was made from the petitioner and he was arraigned as an accused on the basis of a disclosure statement of one Ankit Sharma, who had been arraigned as an accused on the disclosure statement of the main accused Sartaj and Nahim. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is in custody since 03.01.2026; no recovery was made from him; co-accused Paras, who had also been arrested on the disclosure statement of Ankit Sharma, has already been granted regular bail by a co-ordinate Bench vide order dated 29.05.2026 passed in **CRM-M No.29763 of 2026**. Learned counsel submits that the case of the petitioner is at par with that of co-accused Paras and, therefore, he also deserves to be released on bail. Learned counsel submits that even otherwise, trial will take a sufficiently long time and no useful purpose would, therefore, be served by keeping the petitioner in custody any longer.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail. It has been submitted that two other cases stand registered against the petitioner and during the course of investigation, call detail records were obtained which show that the petitioner was in regular touch with Ankit Sharma. Learned State counsel submits that under the circumstances, the bail application deserves to be dismissed.

5. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. Concededly, the petitioner was not arrested on the basis of any

secret information nor any recovery was made from him. The main accused namely Sartaj and Nahim named Mustafa and Ankit Sharma in their disclosure statements and further Ankit Sharma, after his arrest, named the present petitioner in his disclosure statement. He also named one Paras, who has been released on regular bail vide order dated 29.05.2026 passed by a co-ordinate Bench in **CRM-M No.29763 of 2026**. The said Paras had been arrested on 12.11.2025. Still further, as per the reply submitted by the State, final report stands submitted and 31 witnesses are to be examined out of which no witness has been examined till date. It has, therefore, clear that trial will take a sufficiently long time and, therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody any longer. The issue of call detail records etc. is a matter of trial and is, therefore, not relevant at this stage. The 02 other cases against the petitioner would also not go against him keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case.

7. In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate.

June 23, 2026
Yag Dutt

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

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