

2026.PHHC.019175



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

233

CRM-M-51635-2025

Date of decision: 9th February, 2026

Rattan Singh @ Rinku

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. L.S. Sekhon, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 48 dated 26.01.2025 registered under Sections 22-C, 25 and 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substance Act, 1985 (for short 'NDPS Act') and Section 238(A) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Gharaunda, District Karnal.

2. As per the allegations, on 26.01.2025, on receipt of an information that one Verna car bearing registration No. PB-70H-7686 was lying abandoned in the area of Gharaunda, District Karnal, a police party reached there and on checking the same, 29400 tablets of Dicyclomine

2026.PHHC.019175



Hydrochloride Atropine sulphate and 205 strips containing 4920 capsules of Tramadol, two cell phones, copies of Aadhar cards etc. were found lying therein. The vehicle as well as the articles recovered from the same had been taken into possession. During investigation, it was found that the recovered vehicle was owned by Sukhwinder Singh. The petitioner was arrested on 28.01.2025. He was interrogated and suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and also disclosed the name of co-accused Manjit Singh. Subsequently, accused Sukhwinder Singh was also arrested. On conclusion of investigation qua the petitioner and the other arrested accused, challan was presented, and petitioner is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The disclosure statement allegedly suffered by him cannot be admissible in evidence. No new or distinct fact has been discovered in view of this disclosure statement. He was not named in the FIR. The recovered car did not belong to him. He is in custody for a period of over one year. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody anymore. He is not involved in any other case of similar nature. It is, therefore, stressed that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report and custody certificate have been filed by respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner along with the co-accused Sukhwinder Singh and Dalbir Singh had come to Gharaunda to take intoxicant tablets/capsules from co-accused Manjit Singh

2026.PHHC.019175



on the fateful day. On noticing the police officials, they had run away after leaving the vehicle. The mobile phones and Aadhar cards of accused Manjit Singh were left in the vehicle. The contraband had been supplied by accused Manjit Singh to the petitioner and co-accused. The call detail record of the petitioner and co-accused shows that there were conversations between them on or before the date of occurrence. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. His antecedents are not clean. There are chances of his committing similar offences or absconding if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have come to Gharaunda on the fateful day for the purpose of taking supply of contraband from the co-accused Manjit Singh and is further alleged to have taken the intoxicating pills/capsules from him. As per the allegations, his two mobile phones and Aadhar card were left inside the car while running away from the spot. The allegations prima facie suggest his active complicity in the crime. Commercial quantity of contraband was recovered from the vehicle. The rigors of Section 37 of NDPS Act are also attracted against the petitioner as well, irrespective of the fact that he was not arrested from the spot. The allegations against him are serious in nature. The trial has commenced and there is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay conclusion of the same. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts,

2026.PHHC.019175



but without meaning to make any comments upon the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7. Since the main petition has already been decided, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

9th February, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |