



CRM-M-51880-2025 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

226

CRM-M-51880-2025
Decided on : 16.02.2026

AKKY REDDY NANJIPetitioner
Versus
STATE OF HARYANARespondent
CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Arman Goyal, Advocate, for
Mr. Abhimanu Jangra, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Akky Reddy Nanji, aged about 35 years	75	27.04.2025	20 and 29 of NDPS Act	Dhauj	Faridabad

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that, as per the allegations, no recovery was effected from the conscious possession of the petitioner except for a sum of Rs.3,000/- in cash. The alleged recovery of 35 kilograms and 400 grams of *ganja* was effected from a bag lying in the dickey of a Swift Dzire car, bearing registration No.HR-55-AH-6852, which was being driven by the co-accused, namely Yashpal Yadav.



2. Counsel for the petitioner argues that petitioner was not present in the vehicle from which the alleged recovery was effected and there is no direct link connecting him with the recovered contraband. Apart from the disclosure statement allegedly made by co-accused Yashpal Yadav, there is no other admissible evidence collected by the prosecution during the course of investigation.

It is also contended that petitioner was not named by the co-accused at the time of his initial arrest. Rather, it was in a subsequent disclosure statement dated 01.05.2025 that petitioner was named as the supplier of the alleged contraband.

3. Petitioner is in judicial custody since 01.05.2025, i.e., for a period of approximately 9 months and 15 days. Out of total 16 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined, till date. Therefore, conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time. Thus, learned counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate dated 17.09.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

5. As per the custody certificate dated 17.09.2025, petitioner has undergone incarceration for a period of 4 months and 17 days, and no other criminal case is reflected against him therein.

However, learned State counsel submits that although, custody certificate does not mention any other criminal case registered



against the petitioner, but status report dated 11.12.2025, already placed on record, reveals that petitioner is an accused in another FIR No.576/2014 under Section 8(c) read with Section 20(B)(ii) of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Gajuwaka Crime, Visakhapatnam City, Andhra Pradesh. On this basis, it is contended that petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail and present petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has perused the record available before it.

7. A certain confusion has been sought to be created by learned State counsel with regard to the involvement of the petitioner in any other case. Custody certificate dated 17.09.2025, which is not of recent date and has been placed before this Court today, does not reflect registration of any other case against the petitioner. However, from the status report already on record, it transpires that petitioner is involved in one additional case in the State of Andhra Pradesh.

Be that as it may, petitioner is in judicial custody in the present case since 01.05.2025, i.e., for a period of about 9 months and 15 days. His implication in the present case is stated to be based solely upon the disclosure statement made by the co-accused, Yashpal Yadav, and no other substantive material from the status report has been pointed out by learned State counsel to justify further incarceration. In these circumstances, this Court does not find any justification to continue the detention of the petitioner any longer.



CRM-M-51880-2025

4

8. Considering the totality of the circumstances, nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed hereinabove, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing two bail/surety bonds (in view of the fact that he is a resident of the State of Andhra Pradesh) to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

12. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

16.02.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO