

2026:PHHC:036521



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

132

CRM-M-40357-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 10.03.2026

Jasveer Singh @ Jassa

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Amarsh Dudeja, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 546 dated 18.12.2024, registered under Sections 22C and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) at Police Station Pinjore, District Panchkula.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the disposal of the present petition are that on 18.12.2024, on the basis of a secret information, co-accused Sukhchain Singh @ Gora was apprehended by a police party and recovery of 800 intoxicant tablets of Lomotil was effected. Since he could not produce any valid license or permit to keep in his possession the recovered drugs, he was formally arrested at the spot. Upon interrogation, he disclosed that he used to work for the present petitioner, who was indulged in selling intoxicant drugs. He also disclosed that even the recovered drugs were given to him by the petitioner for selling the same. On the basis of the same, the petitioner was

2026:PHHC:036521



nominated in this case as an accused and was arrested on 26.03.2025. Some other persons were also nominated in this case as co-accused. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement of the above named co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He is in custody since 26.03.2025. Although, he has been falsely implicated in three more cases of similar nature but he stands acquitted in two of such cases. No subsequent recovery has been effected from him. There is nothing on record to show that the petitioner was involved in the subject crime in any manner with the co-accused. Even otherwise, investigation has since been completed and challan has been filed. Conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time as only one prosecution witness has been examined so far out of total twenty two witnesses. Co-accused Uvais Ansari and Sameer Khan have already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court. On parity, he too deserves to be granted the same benefit. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on regular bail.

4. Status report along with the custody certificate of the petitioner has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner as well as his criminal antecedents, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail as Section 37 of the NDPS Act would be attracted in this case. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

2026:PHHC:036521



5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

6. The well settled proposition of law is that the Court while considering an application for grant of bail has to keep certain factors in mind, such as, whether there is a prima facie case or reasonable ground to believe that the accused has committed the offence; circumstances which are peculiar to the accused; likelihood of the offence being repeated; the nature and gravity of the accusation; severity of the punishment in the event of conviction; the danger of accused absconding or fleeing, if released on bail and reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being threatened. The period of incarceration is also relevant fact that is to be considered. It is also unequivocally established that, to be granted bail, the accused charged with offence under the provisions of NDPS Act must fulfill the conditions stipulated in Section 37 of the Act. A contention has been raised that the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act are attracted in the present case as there is recovery of commercial quantity of contraband.

7. The case of the prosecution is that the name of the petitioner was disclosed by the above named co-accused, from whom recovery of commercial quantity of the contraband was effected. As per his disclosure statement, he had sourced the contraband from the petitioner for the purpose of selling it further. In *Tofan Singh Vs. State of Tamil Nadu, (2021) 4 SCC 1*, it was observed by Hon'ble Apex Court that the disclosure statements made under Section 67 of NDPS Act, are inadmissible in evidence unless corroborated by independent material. While the veracity of the disclosure statement against the petitioner will be tested during the course of trial, however, at this stage, it cannot be ignored that no recovery was ever effected from the petitioner. The petitioner was arrested on 26.03.2025. There is nothing on record, at this stage, to

2026:PHHC:036521



connect the petitioner either with the subject crime or to show that he was connected with the co-accused in any manner at the relevant time. Investigation has been completed and challan has been filed. Conclusion of trial would take considerable time as most of the witnesses are yet to be examined. Pendency of one more case of similar nature against the petitioner cannot be considered to be a ground for denying him benefit of bail in given circumstances. Above named co-accused, who were also nominated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statements, have been granted concession of bail. The principle of parity also weighs in favour of the petitioner. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it will be open for the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail in case the petitioner is found involved in any other subsequent case.

8. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

10.03.2026
Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No