

2026:PHHC:042288



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

137

CRM-M-65570-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 18.03.2026

Sanjeet Chhikara

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 296 dated 16.07.2025, registered under Sections 22, 22(c) and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) at Police Station City Bahadurgarh, District Jhajjar, Haryana.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the disposal of the present petition are that on 16.07.2025, on the basis of a secret information, co-accused Rahul was apprehended by a police party and recovery of 65 bottles of cough syrup containing Codeine Phosphate & Triprolidine Hydrochloride, 100 ml each, was effected from his conscious possession. Since he could not produce any valid license or permit to keep in his possession the recovered drugs, he was formally arrested at the spot. Upon interrogation, he disclosed that he had procured the recovered contraband from the present petitioner. On the basis of the same, the petitioner was nominated in this case as an accused and was

2026:PHHC:042288



arrested on 10.09.2025. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in commission of subject offences. After completion of necessary investigation and usual formalities, challan was presented in the Court and presently, the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offence.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he was neither found at the spot nor was named in the FIR. He has been nominated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. No subsequent recovery has been effected from him. There is nothing on record to show that the petitioner was involved in the subject crime in any manner with the co-accused. Previously also, he was falsely implicated in a similar case but he has been acquitted in that case. It is further argued that even otherwise, investigation has since been completed and challan has been filed. Conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time as only one out of total seventeen prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. The petitioner is in custody since long. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on regular bail.

4. Status report and the custody certificate of the petitioner have been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner and the fact that commercial quantity of the contraband has been recovered in this case, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail as Section 37 of the NDPS Act would be attracted against him. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be

2026:PHHC:042288



dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

6. The well settled proposition of law is that the Court while considering an application for grant of bail has to keep certain factors in mind, such as, whether there is a prima facie case or reasonable ground to believe that the accused has committed the offence; circumstances which are peculiar to the accused; likelihood of the offence being repeated; the nature and gravity of the accusation; severity of the punishment in the event of conviction; the danger of accused absconding or fleeing, if released on bail and reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being threatened. The period of incarceration is also relevant fact that is to be considered. It is also unequivocally established that, to be granted bail, the accused charged with offence under the provisions of NDPS Act must fulfill the conditions stipulated in Section 37 of the Act. A contention has been raised that the rigors of Section 37 of the NDPS Act are attracted in the present case as there is recovery of commercial quantity of contraband.

7. The case of the prosecution is that the name of the petitioner was disclosed by the above named co-accused, from whom recovery of commercial quantity of the contraband was effected. As per his disclosure statement, he had sourced the contraband from the petitioner. In *Tofan Singh Vs. State of Tamil Nadu, (2021) 4 SCC 1*, it was observed by Hon'ble Apex Court that the disclosure statements made under Section 67 of NDPS Act, are inadmissible in evidence unless corroborated by independent material. While the veracity of the disclosure statement against the petitioner will be tested during the course of trial, however, at this stage, it cannot be ignored that no recovery was ever effected from the petitioner. The petitioner was arrested on 10.09.2025. There

2026:PHHC:042288



is nothing on record, at this stage, to connect the petitioner either with the subject crime or to show that he was connected with the co-accused in any manner at the relevant time. Investigation has been completed and challan has been filed. Conclusion of trial would take considerable time. The petitioner has clean antecedents. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it will be open for the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail in case the petitioner is found involved in any other subsequent case.

8. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

18.03.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No