



::1::

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(221)

CRM-M-39374-2025 (O & M)
Date of decision: 15.10.2025

Parmanand

... Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr.Aditya Sanghi, Advocate,
and Mr. Himanshu Garg, Advocate
with Mr. Rajiv Goel, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vishal Sharda, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.213 dated 24.06.2025 under Sections 105, 123, 3(5) of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station City Mandi Dabwali, District Dabwali, Haryana.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that during investigation Maninderpal Singh @ Maninder and Maanvir @ Moni were arrested in the present case. They suffered their disclosure statements to the effect that they had sold the intoxicant tablets to the deceased-Amritpal and had purchased the same from Sharma Medical Store of the petitioner-Parmanand Sharma. Other than the said disclosure statement, there is no



::2::

other evidence against the petitioner. As he is in custody since 25.06.2025 but none of the 16 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

3. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, has filed a reply dated 14.10.2025 which is taken on record. While referring to the said reply, he contends that the name of the petitioner has been disclosed in the confessional statements of his co-accused, as per which he had sold the tablets which were subsequently consumed by the deceased. The nature of the allegations do not entitle him to the concession of bail. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 25.06.2025 and none of the 16 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

4. The learned counsel for the complainant contends that he has no objection if the petitioner is granted the concession of bail.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. The veracity of the prosecution case against the petitioner and his co-accused shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the Trial. Admittedly, the petitioner is in custody since 25.06.2025 but none of the 16 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial in the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

7. Thus, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner, namely, Parmanand is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.



::3::

8. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from Trial without sufficient cause.

9. The present petition stands disposed of.

10. The pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

**(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE**

October 15, 2025
sukhpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No