

145 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

2026.PHHC:041726



CRM-M-57353-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 17.03.2026

ROSHAN LAL

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. K.S.Siwach, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Dr. Malvika Singh, D.A.G., Haryana.

**H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) in FIR No.603 dated 29.08.2024 registered under Section 22(c) of NDPS Act, 1985 (Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on) at Police Station HTM Hisar, District Hisar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the FIR was registered on the basis of a secret information that co-accused Ravi Dutt Sharma who was allegedly involved in selling of narcotic pills is present near Bank of India, Jahaj Pull, Hisar on his motorcycle. On the basis of said information, a raid was conducted and 37,500 intoxicating pills have been recovered from co-accused Ravi Dutt Sharma.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner has been nominated on the basis of the disclosure statement made by co-accused. The petitioner is in custody for the last 10 months and 10 days.

4. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on

record. She further submits that as per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 10 months and 10 days and out of total 40 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case that apart from the disclosure statement made by the co-accused, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the commission of crime; he is in custody for the last 10 months and 10 days; out of total 40 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far; the trial is yet to commence and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial. Moreover, *'bail is rule and jail is exception'*.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. It is clarified that while on bail so granted through the instant order the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

17.03.2026

Janki

(H.S.GREWAL)  
JUDGE

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