

2026:PHHC:036478



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

129-1

**CRM-M-41674-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.03.2026**

ROHIT KUMAR @ RAVI

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Mr. Harjinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.189 dated 10.04.2025 under Sections 20 and 29 of the NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Sector 13-17, District Panipat.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the four accused persons were apprehended by the police alongwith a Car No.HR-32A-4776 make Mahindra TUV-300 and 1.422 Kgs. of Charas was recovered from a bag which was kept on the rear seat of the said car. The accused persons had parked the abovesaid car near Toll Plaza, G.T. Road, Panipat and were waiting for the customer to deliver him the said contraband. The petitioner has been implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement made by the co-accused persons.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to link the petitioner with the recovered contraband and nothing has been recovered from the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 10 months and 26 days and he is not involved in any other case under NDPS Act. The trial of the case is

yet to commence and as such same will take a long time to conclude. He thus prays that the petitioner be granted the concession of regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Ms. Ruchi Sekhri, Addl. A.G., Haryana accepts notice and vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations and role attributed to the petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence are very serious in nature and the petitioner has actively participated in the alleged offence. Hence, she prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificate filed by the State Counsel is taken on record. As per the said certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 10 months and 26 days.

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

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 10 months and 26 days coupled with the fact that nothing has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner and the trial of the case is likely to take long time to conclude, this Court is of the opinion that the petition in hand deserves to be allowed. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, he is entitled to 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/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

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

10. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

MARCH 09, 2026.

Rajender

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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