



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

219

CRM-M-58407-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.02.2026

Deepak @ Deepu @ Deepak Kadyan

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

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

Mr. Gautam Kaile, DAG Haryana

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.455 dated 28.11.2024, registered under Section 15-C of NDPS Act & Sections 318(4), 347 BNS at Police Station Kalanaur, District Rohtak.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for more than 11 months. He has been implicated based on his own disclosure statement made in another case, however, no recovery has been effected from him in the present case, which was as a matter of fact, from an abundant vehicle not in his ownership. There is no evidence to connect him with the alleged recovery. Charges have been framed on 09.09.2025, however, out of 24 prosecution witnesses, only 4 have been examined. The petitioner is involved in 2 more cases under NDPS Act, in 1 of which, his name surfaced based on the



disclosure statement and is on bail. Reliance is placed on the judgment passed by Hon'ble The Supreme Court titled as **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. The custody certificate dated 11.02.2026, filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 11 months and 11 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations against the petitioner of got demarcated the place from where contraband was recovered and the fake number plate of another vehicle was used by him. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage and the petitioner being on bail in one case.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (Supra) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court, etc."

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 11 months and 11 days; on bail in one case; charges were framed on 09.09.2025, however, 20 more prosecution witnesses still remain to be examined, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right



enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

8. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

9. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as



granted to the petitioner by this order.

10. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

12.02.2026
M.Kamra

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