



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

234

CRM-M-3425 of 2025
Date of decision: 21.07.2025

Gurjeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present: Ms. Himani Anand, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Kumar Sheoran, Addl. A. G. Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.256 dated 12.06.2024, under Sections 15 (Section 29 and 27(a) added later on) of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Kurukshetra University, District Kurukshetra, Haryana.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that co-accused of the petitioner-Angrej Singh @ Geja was found in possession of 464 Kg. Poppy Husk and the petitioner was named by the co-accused Angrej Singh @ Geja while he was in custody.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was falsely implicated in the present case and apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner to the contraband so recovered from the co-accused. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year and 17 days as under trial. He further submits that out of total 23 witnesses, 3 have been examined.



However, it is stated that the petitioner is involved in two more cases under the NDPS Act.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Naveen Kumar Sheoran, Addl. A. G. Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for 01 year and 17 days. He, upon instructions, submits that out of 22 prosecution witnesses, only 3 have been examined. He further submits that petitioner is involved in 2 more cases of the NDPS Act.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that he is not involved in any other case; out of total 22 prosecution witnesses only, 3 have been examined; the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.



8. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of their bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

21.07.2025

anil

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