



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

252

**CRM-M-11731-2025  
Date of decision: 29.07.2025**

**PAWAN KUMAR**

... Petitioner

Versus

**STATE OF HARYANA**

.. Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL****Present:-** Mr. Pavitra, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)**

1. The present is the second petition which has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking regular bail in FIR No.126 dated 09.03.2023 under Sections 18(c) (Section 27A added later on) of NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Sadar Fatehabad, District Fatehabad.

2. The case of the prosecution is that 510 grams of opium was recovered from one Sandeep and Pawan. Thereafter, Sandeep in his disclosure statement has named the petitioner as the seller of the said contraband. The petitioner is involved in 04 mores cases.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 06.04.2024 and has undergone custody period of more than 01 year, 03 months and 23 days and out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, only one has been examined so far.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.



6. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail by way of filing of custody certificate dated 28.07.2025 and further states that the petitioner has undergone custody period of 01 year, 03 months and 23 days and does not refute the fact that the trial in the present case is yet to commence.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that the custody period undergone by the petitioner is more than 01 year, 03 months and 23 days and moreover out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, only one has been examined so far, therefore further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice and also conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time. Therefore, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. The pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

10. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

29<sup>th</sup> July, 2025

*Sonia Puri*

(H.S. GREWAL)  
JUDGE

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