



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

131

CRM-M-57926-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 18.03.2026

Vikram Kumar

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

The State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Madan Sandhu, Advocate;
Mr. Ajay Shekhawat, Advocate;
Ms. Sheena Khanna, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.13 dated 07.02.2024, registered under Section(s) 20(B) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Loharu, District Bhiwani.
2. Affidavit dated 24.11.2024 filed on behalf of respondent-State is already available on file, the same is taken on record.
3. FIR in the present case was registered on the allegations that a secret information was received to the effect that one Naveen son of Satender resident of Jhanjhra, Sheoran and Sonu son of Raj Pal residents of Chahar Khurd are coming from the Jhanjhra side to village Pahadi on their motorcycle bearing Registration No.HR-18E-4884 (HF Delux). It was also averred that in the event they are nabbed, intoxicating material can be

recovered from them. Based upon the said information, a nakabandi was done and two young persons coming on the motorcycle were apprehended and they disclosed their names as Sonu son of Raj Pal residents of Chahar Khurd and Naveen son of Satender resident of Jhanjhra. Form their search, recovery of 14.086 kg of Ganja was allegedly effected.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has been in custody since 23.09.2025 and that no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from him. It is contended that the name of the petitioner cropped up in the present case as an accused on the disclosure of both the above said co-accused from whom the contraband was recovered and they have already been granted the concession of regular bail. It is also contended that the said disclosure has not been corroborated by anybody. He contends that the alleged recovery effected in the present case was an intermediate quantity and further detention of the petitioner not warranted as investigation in the case is already complete and the final report already stands filed.

5. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects. It is also not disputed that recovery effected in the present case was an intermediate quantity and both the co-accused from whom the recovery was effected have already been granted the concession of regular bail. She further does not dispute that there are 16 prosecution witnesses and a *de novo* recording of evidence is yet to commence.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as noted above, including the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner, him being nominated

as an accused on the basis of disclosure and no recovery of any nature whatsoever being effected from him and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

18.03.2026

Mangal Singh

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