



CRM-M-29059-2025 (O&amp;M) 1

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

207

**CRM-M-29059-2025 (O&M)  
Decided on : 29.05.2025**

VIKRAM SINGH @ VIKKI

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Mr. Navmohit Singh, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. S.S. Pannu, Addl. AG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J.**

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 hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Vikram Singh @ Vikki, aged about 31 years	229	07.04.2025	18 of NDPS Act (18-B, 27-A, 29, 61, 85 of NDPS Act added lateron)	Sadar Thanesar	Kurukshetra

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that recovery of 2.60 kilograms of opium has been effected from co-accused persons, namely Sukhwinder Singh and Balbir Singh, and name of the petitioner



does not find mention in the FIR. It is submitted that petitioner has been implicated in the present case solely on the basis of the disclosure statements made by the already arrested co-accused, wherein it is alleged that petitioner was to purchase 200 grams of opium from the recovered quantity of 2.6 kilograms. However, no actual sale or purchase of opium has taken place, and allegations against the petitioner are purely presumptive and speculative in nature.

Further submits that disclosure statement, in itself, is not admissible in evidence unless it is supported by other independent and corroborative material. In the absence of any such connecting evidence, the disclosure statement alone cannot form the basis for implicating the petitioner in the present case.

3. It is further submitted that no specific act constituting a crime is attributed to the petitioner, who has been in judicial custody for the last one month and twenty days. Counsel also asserts that petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case of a similar nature, and no other case stands registered against him. He further argues that continued incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose for the prosecution and, therefore, prays for the grant of bail.

4. On advance notice, and while opposing the prayer and submissions made by counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel submits that petitioner is a member of a gang involved in the illicit trafficking of drugs. It is contended that releasing the petitioner on bail may not only hamper the ongoing proceedings but also send a wrong



CRM-M-29059-2025 (O&M) 3

message to society, given the gravity of the offence. Thus, prays for dismissal of the present bail petition.

5. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed hereinabove, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

6. 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.

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

8. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

29.05.2025  
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO  
Whether Reportable: YES/NO