



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

153-2

CRM-M-71379-2025
Decided on : 16.03.2026

Jitender Singh @ Rohit @ Jeetendra Singh . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. DPS Bajwa, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Jitender Singh @ Rohit @ Jeetendra Singh	298	19.05.2024	20/25 of NDPS Act, 1985	Kundli	Sonipat

2. As per the allegations in the FIR, upon receipt of secret information regarding the two accused, namely, Harish Kumar @ Thapa and Sunil @ Dhillo @ Sunil Kumar, who were allegedly travelling from Village Nahra towards Narela via Rampur Border, Village Nahri, in a car bearing registration No. DL4-CAX-9249, a police team laid a naka/checkpoint. The said car was intercepted at the checkpoint.

Said car was being driven by the accused Sunil @ Dhillo @ Sunil Kumar, whereas, the second accused – Harish Kumar @ Thapa was



sitting on the front passenger seat and was allegedly found in possession of a black-coloured polythene bag bearing the label “CORE FUEL WHEY PROTEIN POWDER” printed in black and yellow. Upon search, the said bag was found to contain *charas* weighing 2.400 kg. Subsequent to their arrest, present petitioner was nominated as an accused solely on the basis of the disclosure statement.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that both the main accused, named in the FIR, i.e., Sunil @ Dhilllo @ Sunil Kumar and Harish Kumar @ Thapa, have been granted concession of bail by this Court. In this regard, learned counsel refers to order dated 26.09.2025, passed in CRM-M-18877-2025, titled as, “*Sunil @ Dhilllo @ Sunil Kumar v. State of Haryana*” (P-2), whereas, another accused – Harish Kumar @ Thapa, has been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order of even date, passed in connected case, i.e., CRM-M-60368-2025, titled as, “*Harish Kumar @ Thapa v. State of Haryana*” . Thus, he submits that case of the petitioner is on even better footings than the case of already bailed out main accused persons.

Accordingly, on the ground of parity, as well as keeping in view that the petitioner’s implication rests solely on the disclosure statement of the co-accused and no recovery has been effected from him, it is prayed that the petitioner also deserves to be extended the same benefit of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the petitioner has been named on the basis of the disclosure statement made by accused persons, from whose possession 2.400 kg of *charas* was recovered.

Besides, learned State counsel candidly admits that no recovery of any narcotic contraband has been effected from the petitioner, and his



implication rests solely upon the disclosure statement of the main accused persons.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully perused the record, including the reply filed on behalf of the State.

6. At this stage, it is not disputed by the State that no recovery of any narcotic drug or psychotropic substance has been effected from the petitioner, nor was he present at the time of recovery and arrest of the main accused – Sunil @ Dhilllo @ Sunil Kumar and Harish Kumar @ Thapa. His implication in the present case rests entirely upon the disclosure statement of main accused persons.

7. It is further undisputed that both the main accused persons, from whose conscious possession a total of 2.400 kg of *charas* was recovered, have already been granted regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 25.09.2025 and 16.03.2026. Once the principal offenders are already on bail, the case of the petitioner, against whom no recovery has been effected, *prima facie* stands on better footings for parity, subject to other relevant considerations.

Accordingly, without commenting upon the merits of the case lest it may prejudice either side during trial, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of regular bail, particularly on the ground of **parity**, absence of **personal recovery**, and the **nature of evidence**.

Consequently, prayer made in 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/



Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

10. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 16, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No