

2026:PHHC:030133



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

CRM-M-45076-2025 (O&M)

Hardik Grover ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	25.02.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	26.02.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	26.02.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Kashyap, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

- Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 295 dated 22.09.2024, registered under Sections 21(c), 27(a) and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) at Police Station Parao, District Ambala.
- Brief facts of the case relevant for the disposal of the present petition are that on 22.09.2024, on the basis of a secret information, the petitioner, while coming on a motorcycle bearing registration number HR-85-H-9781, was apprehended by a police party and recovery of 258.39 grams of heroin was

2026:PHHC:030133



effected from his conscious possession. On interrogation, he disclosed that one Rahul @ Paua had given him money and the aforesaid motorcycle to bring heroin from a Nigerian person in Delhi. The said Rahul @ Paua was also nominated in this case and was arrested on 26.01.2025. Some other persons were also nominated in this case. Investigation now stands completed and challan has been filed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The story put forth by the police party is concocted one. In fact, a false recovery was planted upon him. The mandatory provisions of the NDPS Act were not complied with properly. Even otherwise, the quantity of the contraband allegedly recovered from the petitioner is marginally higher than the commercial quantity. Investigation has since been completed and challan has been presented before the Court. The trial is likely to take considerable time. The petitioner is in custody since 22.09.2024. He is not involved in any other case of similar nature. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. It is, thus, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed. Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon the judgments cited as *Amritpal Singh vs. State of Punjab : 2022 (3) Law Herald 1996*, *Karandeep Singh @ Sunny vs. State of Punjab : 2021 (3) Law Herald 2230* and *Mandeep Singh alias Lakhari vs. State of Punjab : 2022 (1) Law Herald 74*, whereby the accused, from whom the contraband marginally above the commercial quantity was recovered, were granted concession of bail.

4. Status report and custody certificate have been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner was apprehended by the police party on 22.09.2024 and recovery of commercial quantity of contraband was effected from him. The rigors of Section 37 of the

2026:PHHC:030133



NDPS Act would be attracted against him. Trial is going on at a proper pace. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner is in custody since 22.09.2024. The quantity of the contraband recovered from him is marginally above than the commercial quantity. Though the allegations levelled against the petitioner make out a prima facie case against the petitioner for commission of subject offences, however, on a perusal of the record, it is apparent that there are no chances of conclusion of the trial in near future and it will take considerable time as there are as many as 25 prosecution witnesses, out of which none has been examined so far. The petitioner is not shown to be involved in any other case of similar nature. Therefore, keeping in view the aforesaid facts as well as the ratio of law laid down in aforecited authorities, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves to be granted benefit of regular bail. 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.

7. 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.

26.02.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No