



CRM-M-62476-2025

1

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

225

**CRM-M-62476-2025
Decided on :04.02.2026**

Pargat Singh

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Rajdeep Singh Gill, Advocate
Mr. Gaurav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in FIR No. 252 dated 21.08.2025, under Sections 22-C and 29 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station City Kaithal, District Kaithal.

2. Case of the prosecution is that while the members of the police team were on patrol duty, a secret informant arrived on a motorcycle and informed them that a person namely Vikram Kumar is indulged in the business of selling prohibited intoxicant tablets and is in the habit of keeping such tablets in his possession at his residence. Acting on the said information, a raid was conducted at his house, during which 18,600 alprazolam tablets and 5,000 tramadol capsules were recovered from a bed lying inside the house.



CRM-M-62476-2025

2

On the same day, i.e. 21.08.2025, Vikram Kumar made a disclosure statement naming one Jasmer Singh; however, nothing was recovered from the said accused. Jasmer Singh also recorded a disclosure statement naming one Gopal, but no recovery could be effected from him either.

Thereafter, another disclosure statement of Gopal was recorded on 22.08.2025, wherein the petitioner was named as an accused, and pursuant thereto, the petitioner was also arrested in the present case.

2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner argues that at the time of the petitioner's arrest, nothing was recovered from his possession except an amount of ₹5,000/-, which has been assumed by the prosecution to be drug money without any basis.

Broadly, from the status report already filed by the State, the facts as stated by learned counsel are also borne out, as the disclosure statements of co-accused Vikram Kumar, Jasmer Singh, Gopal Krishan, and Pargat Singh have been appended thereto.

As per paragraph No. 6 of the status report, co-accused Gopal Krishan recorded a disclosure statement on 22.08.2025, wherein he disclosed that the petitioner-Pargat Singh had supplied him 15 boxes of Tramadol 100 SR after receiving an amount of ₹52,500/-. However, after his arrest, Gopal Krishan got recovered only ₹4,000/-.

In paragraph No. 7, it is recorded that Pargat Singh was arrested on 22.08.2025 and that an amount of ₹5,000/- was recovered from his house. However, nothing has been mentioned therein to suggest

**CRM-M-62476-2025****3**

that any contraband covered under the provisions of the NDPS Act was recovered from his possession.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully perused the paper-book, along with the documents appended thereto, including the status report.

4. Upon perusal of the complete status report and the disclosure statements, this Court does not find that the State has placed reliance on any other material, such as telephonic conversations between the petitioner and co-accused, or any trail of monetary transactions either between them or among the other accused.

5. Undoubtedly, these aspects would be the subject matter of trial, and it shall remain open to the prosecution to lead any such evidence, if so collected during the course of investigation. However, considering the nature of the allegations, the manner in which the petitioner has been implicated in the present case, and the absence of any direct evidence reflected in the status report, this Court finds merit in the prayer for bail. Consequently, the present petition is allowed.

Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

6. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case.

**CRM-M-62476-2025****4**

Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

7. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioner is found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

8. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

04.02.2026***Rashmi***

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No