



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

127

CRM-M-66267-2025
Date of decision: 01.04.2026

AMAN

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

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

Present: - Mr. Sandeep Singh Jattan, Advocate and
Ms. Sundeep Kaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant second 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. 254 dated 18.06.2024, registered under Section(s) 22-C and 29 of the N.D.P.S. Act, 1985 at Police Station Gandhi Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. The FIR in the present case has been registered on the ruqa sent by Sub Inspector Satish Kumar. As per prosecution case, co-accused Deepak @ Tishu was apprehended by the aforesaid Sub Inspector on 18.06.2024 and 480 capsules (10 stripes containing Tramadol Hydrochloride Paracetamol Dicyclomine Hydrochloride and 10 strips containing Dicyclomine

Hydrochloride Tramadol Hydrochloride Acetaminophen), total weighing 267.8 grams) have been recovered from him. The name of the petitioner cropped up in the disclosure of the said co-accused but no recovery of any nature was effected from the petitioner. The petitioner was, however, arrested on 28.03.2025 and has been in custody since then. Investigation in the case is complete and only 03 witnesses out of a total of 20 witnesses have been examined so far. He contends that the petitioner had withdrawn his earlier petition for grant of regular bail on 01.10.2025 and liberty was granted to him to file a fresh petition after completion of one year which stands fulfilled and that in any case, the said accused from whom recovery had been effected, was granted concession of bail on 28.10.2025 i.e after withdrawal of the bail petition by the petitioner herein.

3. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the facts as noticed above.

4. Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, the absence of recovery, the stage of the trial as well as the fact that the co-accused from whom recovery had been effected has already been granted concession of regular bail, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

5. 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.

6. 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.
7. 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.

APRIL 01, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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