



CRM-M-55659-2025, 57817-2025 and 1342-2026

-1-

208+116 **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA**
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision: 06.04.2026

CRM-M-55659-2025

Joginder @ Joga

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CRM-M-57817-2025

Rohit @ Sonu

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CRM-M-1342-2026

Rajiya Khatun

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Rakesh Kumar Lathwal, Advocate
 for the petitioner in CRM-M-55659 and 57817-2025.

 Mr. Anil Kumar Malik, Advocate,
 for the petitioner in CRM-M-1342-2026.

 Mr. Paras Talwar, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

 Since all these petitions arise out of the same FIR, hence, they are being decided by a common order. Brief facts of the case are, however, extracted from CRM-M-55659-2025.

2. This petition(s) has/have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS,



2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.27 dated 05.02.2025, under Section(s) 20(b)(ii)(c) of NDPS Act registered at Police Station Baroda, District Sonapat.

3. The case in hand pertains to the recovery of 1.115 kgs Charas from the bonnet of the car, which is owned and driven by co-accused Ranbir @ Kala while petitioner Joginder @ Joga and Rohit @ Sonu were fellow passengers. Insofar as, petitioner Rajiya Khatun is concerned, she was nominated as an accused on the disclosure of co-accused Sahil.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner Rajiya Khatun contends that said co-accused Sahil has already been granted the concession of regular bail. Learned counsel for the petitioners Joginder @ Joga and Rohit @ Sonu contend that they were co-passengers and were nominated as an accused solely on account of travelling along with co-accused Ranbir @ Kala. Learned counsel further contends that no recovery of any nature has been effected from the petitioners or at their disclosure. Further, petitioner Rajiya Khatun is in custody since 28.08.2025, petitioner Joginder @ Joga is in custody since 05.02.2025 while petitioner Rohit is in custody since 06.02.2025. It is further submitted that so far as petitioner Joginder @ Joga is concerned, he is not involved in any other case while petitioner Rohit is involved in one more case under the NDPS Act in which he is already on bail. Learned counsel submits that no witness out of 34 cited by the prosecution, has been examined so far, thus, conclusion of the trial shall take long time.

5. On the other hand, State counsel contends that there are three other cases registered against the petitioner Rajiya Khatun. He, however, does



not dispute the remaining facts as pointed by the counsel for the petitioners.

6. On a pointed query put to the learned State counsel, he submits that the link between petitioner Rajiya Khatun, Sahil and Ranbir @ Kala was established by way of money transfer into the account of Sahil. It is not disputed that there is no established financial transaction *inter se* between the petitioner Rajiya Khatun and co-accused Ranbir @ Kala. He also does not dispute that co-accused Sahil has already been granted the concession of bail by this Court.

7. Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the case against the petitioner Rajiya Khatun is solely based on the disclosure statement and her case is very similar to the co-accused Sahil, who has already been granted the concession of bail in CRM-M-28660-2025 and that no recovery has been effected from any of the petitioners as well as the fact that trial is yet to commence, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioners on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

8. The instant petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. It is made clear that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an



CRM-M-55659-2025, 57817-2025 and 1342-2026

-4-

expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

06.04.2026
sonia

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No