

2026:PHHC:023997



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

312

CRM-M-66961-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 17.02.2026

Darbar Singh Sisodiya @ Darbar Singh Sisodia

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. P. S. Jammu, 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. 284 dated 23.08.2025, registered under Section 15(c) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (*for short 'NDPS Act'*) at Police Station City Dabwali, District Sirsa.

2. As per the allegations, on 23.08.2025, a secret information was received by ASI Pritam Singh that one Tarsem Singh was involved in the business of sale of Doda Post and at that point of time, he was present on the road side of Village Desu Jodha. He had kept three gunny bags carrying Doda Post in the same and had covered those bags with a plastic sheet and was intending to sell the same to somebody. It was informed that he could be

2026:PHHC:023997



apprehended with the contraband. Believing the secret information to be true, a raiding party was formed which reached at the informed place and found the accused Tarsem Singh standing there. On noticing the police party, he tried to flee. He was apprehended. The plastic cover was removed and three bags were found kept beneath the same. The accused Tarsem Singh admitted that those bags belonged to him but could not give any satisfactory reply about the articles contained therein. After completion of usual formalities, the bags were checked and 53 kgs and 625 grams of Doda Post was recovered from the same, which was taken into possession. The accused Tarsem Singh on interrogation disclosed that he had purchased the contraband from co-accused Palminder Singh @ Pinder, who was nominated as accused in this case. He was arrested on 03.10.2025. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the subject crime and also disclosed that he had purchased the recovered contraband from the present petitioner. On the basis of the same, the petitioner was nominated as accused in this case and was arrested on 06.10.2025. Recovery of drug money of Rs.10,000/- was effected from him. Investigation now stands completed and challan has been filed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement of the above named co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. A false recovery of drug money of Rs.10,000/- was planted upon him. He has clean antecedents. No subsequent recovery of any contraband 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. Even otherwise, investigation has since been completed and challan has been filed.

2026:PHHC:023997



Conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time as even charges have not been framed 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 along with the custody certificate of the petitioner has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail as Section 37 of the NDPS Act would be attracted in this case. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be 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.

2026:PHHC:023997



7. The case of the prosecution is that the name of the petitioner was disclosed by the abovenamed co-accused Palminder Singh @ Pinder, who himself was nominated on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by accused Tarsem Singh, 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 has been effected from the petitioner. The petitioner was arrested on 06.10.2025. There 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 as even charges have not been framed so far. 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.

2026:PHHC:023997



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.

17.02.2026
Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No