

2025:PHHC:129920



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

224

**CRM-M No.24121 of 2025  
Date of decision: 19.09.2025**

Pale Khan

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Siddarth, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,  
for the respondent-State.

----

**MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)**

1. The present one is the second petition as filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS") seeking regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.301 dated 01.08.2024 registered under Sections 20 and 29 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short 'NDPS Act') at Police Station Ladwa, District Kurukshetra, Haryana. The first petition as filed by the petitioner bearing CRM-M No.4478 of 2025 had been dismissed vide order dated 24.03.2025.

2. As per the allegations, recovery of 1 kg and 10 grams of charas

2025:PHHC:129920



was effected from the co-accused Ajay and Ravinder on 01.08.2024. On interrogation, they disclosed that they had purchased the contraband from the petitioner for a sum of Rs.60,000/-. The petitioner was arrested on 27.10.2024. Presently, he along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody for a period of about 10 months and 22 days. No recovery has been effected from him. He has been nominated as accused on the basis of disclosure statement. The extended period of his incarceration is a sufficient ground for extending benefit of bail to him. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, on the other hand, has argued that the commercial quantity of contraband was recovered from the co-accused which was sold by the petitioner. There was exchange of call detail record between the petitioner and the co-accused Ravinder showing his complicity in the crime. There is no new ground to allow the prayer as made by the petitioner. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The case of the prosecution is that the name of the petitioner was disclosed by the co-accused Ravinder and Ajay from whom recovery of commercial quantity of charas was effected and as per their

2025:PHHC:129920



disclosure statement, they had sourced the contraband from the petitioner. The veracity of the disclosure statement against the petitioner is to be tested during trial. He is in custody since 27.10.2024. Keeping in view the extended period of incarceration spent by the petitioner, the nature of the allegations along with the part attributed to the petitioner and the above discussed facts, this Court is of the opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

**(MANISHA BATRA)**  
**JUDGE**

**19.09.2025**

manju

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No