



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

**CRM-M-46449-2024
Date of decision: 11.02.2026**

ATTAR SINGH

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Ms. Tanya Vashist, Advocate for
Mr. Amit Khari, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Senior DAG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

1. By way of the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. (now 483 BNSS, 2023) the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case FIR No.37 dated 25.02.2024 registered under Sections 20/29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short 'NDPS Act') at Police Station Madlauda, District Panipat.

2. Brief facts of the prosecution are that on 09.10.2024, when the police party was present at Bus Stop of Village Nohra for patrolling duty and in search of anti-social elements, they received a secret information that one Daya Singh will come from the side of village Aasan Kalan and go to Panipat to sell narcotics. Upon which, the police party conducted barricading and the accused was apprehended. Upon his personal search, 1.5 kg of Charas was recovered from the seat of his vehicle in a transparent polythene. Hence, the



FIR was registered. Upon the disclosure statement of accused-Daya Singh, the petitioner was nominated as accused in the present FIR, being the supplier of the recovered contraband.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case; the petitioner has been nominated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused, which is inadmissible in evidence; except the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence available on record against the petitioner; nothing has been recovered from the petitioner; co-accused, namely, Manoharma @ Kalwati and Sunil @ Kala @ Sunil Kumar Bhandari have already been granted the concession of regular bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 09.09.2024 passed in **CRM-M No.37149 & 42321 of 2024** (Annexure P-4) and the petitioner is in custody since 26.02.2024. As such, learned counsel prayed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel has filed additional status report by way of an affidavit of Atma Ram, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Panipat-II, which is taken on record. Learned State counsel opposed the prayer made by the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in two more cases under the NDPS Act, out of which, in one case, he has also been convicted and besides the disclosure statement, there is material available on record in the form of Call Detail Records. As such, learned State counsel prays for dismissal of the present petition seeking regular bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard.



6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the contention of learned State counsel that as per the status report, the petitioner is involved in 02 more cases under the NDPS Act, out of which, in one case, he has been convicted; trial is ongoing and is at the stage of prosecution evidence and besides the disclosure statement, there is material available on record in the form of Call Detail Records to show the complicity of the petitioner, hence, this Court finds no merit in the present petition and the same stands dismissed accordingly. Long incarceration is not a sufficient ground to extend the relief of bail to an accused involved in a serious offence i.e. supply of drugs, and also having criminal antecedents in similar offence.

7. While granting the concession of bail, the Court is required to look beyond the offence in isolation and take into account the surrounding circumstances, including the impact of the crime on society, the likely effect of the grant of bail on the societal interest, and the possibility of the accused indulging in similar illegal activities or otherwise impeding the progress of the trial.

8. The offence of drug peddling or dealing in narcotic substances is not merely a crime against an individual or a simple violation of statutory provisions, but is an offence against society at large. The increasing prevalence of drugs has far-reaching ramifications on the youth, and consequently, on the social fabric. Considering the gravity of the offence and its serious societal repercussions, this Court finds no justification to extend the relief of bail to the petitioner.

9. However, the trial Court is directed to conclude the trial expeditiously.



10. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be expression of an opinion by this Court on merits of the case. The learned Court below is directed to proceed with the matter on its own merits, lest it may prejudice the trial.

February 11, 2026
manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |