



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220

CRM-M-64894-2025
Date of decision: 17.02.2026

ARSHDEEP SINGHPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

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

Present: - Mr. Parminder Singh Sekhon, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Parshant, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 79 dated 17.03.2024, registered under Section(s) 15 and 29 of the NDPS Act, 1985 and Section 483 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Sadar Sonipat, District Sonipat.
2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that it is a case of chance recovery from a vehicle bearing registration No. CH01CM-0586 make Etios that had met with an accident. The Police official(s) approached the Car and on inspection confirmed the presence of intoxicants weighing 192 Kg of poppy husk inside. The car had been

transferred in favour of Lakha Singh, who was also driving the said vehicle.

3. Counsel contends that the petitioner was nominated as an accused on the statement of co-accused Lakha Singh, who stated that the petitioner was escorting the said car bearing CH01CM-0586. On the basis of the said disclosure statement, the petitioner was taken in custody on 08.07.2025. Counsel contends that no evidence has been collected by the Investigating Agency on the basis whereof the aforesaid disclosure statement may link the petitioner with Lakha Singh-co-accused. It is contended that had the allegations against the petitioner been true, there would have been some link evidence to establish that the petitioner was in contact with Lakha Singh. He further argues that the said co-accused Lakha Singh has already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 16.06.2025.

4. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the aforesaid facts. He, however, contends that the petitioner was nominated as an accused in one other case under the NDPS Act, 1985. He, however, does not dispute that the petitioner has already been granted concession of bail in the said case.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, the period of custody undergone, the stage of the trial and that even charges are yet to be framed and there are 20 witnesses to be examined in the present case, hence, conclusion of trial shall take long time, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

6. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

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

8. 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.

FEBRUARY 17, 2026

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

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