

CRM-M-25360-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-25360-2025
Reserved on: 02.09.2025
Pronounced on: 25.09.2025

OM PARKASH

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Raj Kumar Arya, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Pooja Nayar Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
20	22.02.2025	Ranjit Avenue, District Amritsar	22/29/61/81/85 of NDPS Act

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail second time.

2. Per paragraph 11 of the bail application, the petitioner has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1.	45	21.04.2019	353/186/332/506/333/3 4 of IPC	Jhander District Amritsar

3. The facts and allegations are taken from para 4 & 5 of the reply dated 26-06-2025, filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“4. That the deponent humbly submits that as per official record, the facts of the present case FIR No. 20 dated 22.02.2025 (supra) are that on 22.02.2025, the police party headed by ASI Gurdial Singh, Police Station Ranjit Avenue, Amritsar had apprehended the co-accused Sukhraj Singh @ Gori S/o Balwinder Singh and Anhad Parkash son of the present petitioner Om Parkash from the area of PR chowk, Ranjit Avenue, Amritsar who were coming in one car made Zen bearing No. CH03-C-3726. During checking of their car, 70 strips containing total 700 intoxicating tablets of Tramadol

Hydrochloride were recovered. The above said co-accused Sukhraj Singh @ Gori and Anhad Parkash could not produce any license or any other valid document to keep possession of the recovered 700 intoxicant tablets, which were taken into police possession in accordance with law. Hence, the present case FIR No. 20 dated 22.02.2025, under Section 22/61/85 NDPS Act, Police Station Ranjit Avenue, Amritsar was registered in this respect and the above said accused Sukhraj Singh @ Gori and Anhad Parkash were arrested in this case.

5. That the deponent humbly submits that during investigation, the above said accused Sukhraj Singh @ Gori and Anhad Parkash son of the present petitioner Om Parkash made voluntary disclosure statements dated 22.02.2025 before the investigating officer that they had purchased the above recovered 700 intoxicant tablets in Rs. 8000/- from Manpreet Singh and Shivam C/o DM Medical Store, 88 feet road, Khandewala chowk, Majitha road, Amritsar. Om Parkash (present petitioner) father of Anhad Parkash sells these intoxicant tablets to addicts at his medical store at village Tera Kalan. Therefore, based on these disclosure statements, the present petitioner Om Parkash and aforesaid Shivam and Manpreet were also nominated as co-accused in this case vide GD No. 16 dated 23.02.2025. The disclosure memo of Sukhraj Singh and Anhad Parkash son of the petitioner Om Parkash are annexed herewith as Annexure R-1/T & R-2/T for kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court.”

4. The Investigator claims to have complied with all the statutory requirements of the NDPS Act, 1985, and BNSS, 2023.

5. During the custodial interrogation, the co-accused named the petitioner as the seller of the drugs, and based on this confession, the investigator arraigned him as an accused.

6. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

7. The petitioner's counsel submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, or commits any offence under the NDPS Act, where the quantity involved is more than half of the intermediate, or commercial quantity, or violates S. 19, or 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Special Judge or Sessions Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

CRM-M-25360-2025

8. The State’s counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

REASONING:

9. Dealing in commercial quantity of tramadol in contravention of the NDPS Act, 1985, constitutes an offense under the following provisions and notifications:

Substance Name	Tramadol
Punishable U/s	S.22(c) of NDPS Act, 1985
Quantity type	Commercial

Drug's Small & Commercial Qty. suggested by Committee report	
Notification No. & date	S.O. 1762 (E) dated 26.04.2018

<i>Specified as small & Commercial in S.2(viia) & 2(xxiii) NDPS Act, 1985</i>		
Notification No. & dated	S.O.1762(E)	4/26/2018
Sr. No.	238 ZH	
Common Name (Name of Narcotic Drug and Psychotropic Substance (International non-proprietary name (INN)	Tramadol	
Other non-proprietary name	*****	
Chemical Name	*****	
Small Quantity	< 5 Gram	
Commercial Quantity	> 250 Gram	

Declared as punishable under NDPS Act and as per schedule defined in S.2(xi) & 2(xxiii) NDPS Act, 1985		
Notification No. & dated	S.O.1761(E) & S.O. 3448(E)	26-Apr-2018 & 26-Jul-2018

Sr. No.	110Y	
Common Name (Name of Narcotic Drug and Psychotropic Substance (International non-proprietary name (INN)	Tramadol	
Other non-proprietary name	*****	

Chemical Name	*****
---------------	-------

10. The quantity allegedly involved in this case is commercial. Given this, the rigors of S. 37 of the NDPS Act apply in the present case. The petitioner must satisfy the twin conditions put in place by the Legislature under Section 37 of the NDPS Act.

11. It would be appropriate to refer to paras 18 to 21 of the reply dated 26-06-2025, which read as follows:

“THE NAME AND TOTAL WEIGHT OF THE DRUG.

18. That it is submitted that in the present case FIR No.20 dated 22.02.2025 (supra), the following recoveries of intoxicant tablets and injections have been made from the co-accused. The report of RTFSL qua 700 intoxicant tablets recovered from co-accused Sukhraj Singh and Anahad Parkash has been received whereas the report of RTFSL with respect to contrabands recovered from co-accused Manpreet Singh is awaited; hence the actual weight of the contrabands recovered from co-accused Manpreet Singh would be confirmed after receipt of the report of RTFSL:

<i>Date</i>	<i>Name of accused</i>	<i>Name of drug recovered</i>	<i>Total weight/quantity of the drug</i>
<i>22.02.2025</i>	<i>1. Sukhraj Singh @ Gori 2. Anhad Parkash</i>	<i>Tramadol Hydrochloride Tablets 100 Mg (As per report of FSL- Tramadol Hydrochloride)</i>	<i>Total 700/- Tablets As per report of FSL-Average weight: 317 mg/tablet Total weight: 221.9 gram</i>
<i>23.02.2025</i>	<i>Manpreet Singh</i>	<i>Injection-Tramadol Hydrochloride</i>	<i>1350/- injections</i>
		<i>Injection of NRX Pentaxocine</i>	<i>200 injections</i>
		<i>Tablets of Alprazolam</i>	<i>16200/- tablets</i>
		<i>Injections of NRX Pentazocine</i>	<i>200 injections</i>
		<i>Tablets of NRX Tramadol Hydrochloride</i>	<i>2500/-tablets</i>
		<i>Tablets of Tramadol</i>	<i>1800/- tablets</i>

		<i>Hydrochloride</i>	
		<i>Tablets of Hydrochloride Trekem</i>	<i>800 tablets</i>
		<i>Tablest of Clovedool-100 SR</i>	<i>360 tablets</i>

THE EVIDENCE BASED ON WHICH THE PETITIONER WAS ARRAIGNED AS AN ACCUSED

19. That it is submitted that the present petitioner Om Parkash was nominated on the basis of disclosure statements suffered by the co-accused persons namely Sukhraj Singh @ Gori, Anhad Parkash and Manpreet Singh wherein they all disclosed that Om Parkash (present petitioner) father of the above said co-accused Anhad Parkash has medical store at village Tera Kalan and Om Parkash (present petitioner) also used to purchase intoxicant tablets from co-accused Manpreet Singh and Shivam Diwan.

THE EVIDENCE AGAINST THE PETITIONER

20. That it is submitted that the prosecution evidence against the present petitioner Shivam Diwan is primarily based on the disclosure statements suffered by the co-accused persons namely Sukhraj Singh@ Gori, Anhad Parkash (son of the present petitioner Om Parkash) and Manpreet Singh wherein they all disclosed that the present petitioner Om Parkash runs a medical store at village Terha Kalan, where he along with his son i.e. co-accused Anhad Parkash sells intoxicant tablets. The petitioner Om Parkash used to purchase intoxicant tablets from co-accused Manpreet Singh and Shivam Diwan. Furthermore, as per call details record of the mobile phone of the present petitioner Om Parkash, he has exchanged several calls with co-accused Manpreet Singh and Shivam Diwan. The disclosure memos of co-accused Sukhraj Singh, Anahad Parkash and Manpreet Singh are annexed as Annexure R-1/T, R-2/T & R-3/T and call details record is annexed as Annexure R-4 for kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court.

THE ROLE OF THE PETITIONER

21. That it is submitted that the present petitioner Om Parkash under garb of running a medical store at village Terha Kalan, was selling intoxicant tablets illegally. The above mentioned entire intoxicant tablets and injections recovered in this case from the co-accused persons Sukhraj Singh@ Gori and Anhad Parkash son of the present petitioner Om Parkash were to be sold by the present petitioner Om Parkash at his medical store.”

12. Per status report, petitioner has call history with co-accused and one of main accused is petitioner's son and it is normal for a conversation between a son and his father and also between the father and the friends of his son that can not be termed as dealing of contraband. The investigation wants to fish for evidence through custodial interrogation, which cannot be permitted given the evidence in the shape of disclosure statement of co-accused to be seeler.

13. The evidence collected so far consists of disclosure statements. Such statements can be proven subject to the mandatory restrictions imposed in S. 25 & 26 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ S. 23 of BSA, 2023.

14. In *Tofan Singh v. State of Tamil Nadu*, (2021) 4 SCC 1, the majority view of a three-member bench holds as follows:

We answer the reference by stating:

(i) That the officers who are invested with powers under section 53 of the NDPS Act are "police officers" within the meaning of section 25 of the Evidence Act, as a result of which any confessional statement made to them would be barred under the provisions of section 25 of the Evidence Act, and cannot be taken into account in order to convict an accused under the NDPS Act.

(ii) That a statement recorded under section 67 of the NDPS Act cannot be used as a confessional statement in the trial of an offence under the NDPS Act.

15. The status report filed by the police reveals that the investigator arraigned the petitioner as an accused based on the disclosure statement of the main accused, from whose possession the investigator had recovered the contraband. No other evidence is collected at this stage to connect the petitioner with the main accused. Thus, there is no justification to deny bail. Consequently, the petitioner has satisfied the first rider of section 37 of the NDPS Act. Regarding the second rider of S. 37, this court will put very stringent conditions in this order to ensure that the petitioner does not repeat the offense.

16. For now, the petitioner has prima facie satisfied the first condition of section 37 of the NDPS Act to make a case for bail. Regarding the second rider of S. 37, this court will put very stringent conditions in this order to ensure that the petitioner does not repeat the offense.

17. In *Abida v. State of Haryana*, 2022:PHHC:058722, [Para 10], CRM-M-5077-2022, decided on 13-05-2022, this court observed as follows:

[10]. Thus, both the twin conditions need to be satisfied before a person accused of possessing a commercial quantity of drugs or psychotropic substance is to be released on bail. The first condition is to provide an opportunity to the Public Prosecutor, enabling to take a stand on the bail application. The second stipulation is that the Court must be satisfied that reasonable grounds exist for believing that the accused is not guilty of such offence, and is not likely to commit any offence while on bail. If either of these two conditions is not met, the ban on granting bail operates. The expression “reasonable grounds” means something more than prima facie grounds. It contemplates substantial probable causes for believing that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence. Even on fulfilling one of the conditions, the reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of such an offence, the Court still cannot give a finding on assurance that the accused is not likely to commit any such crime again. Thus, the grant of bail or denial of bail for possessing commercial quantity would vary from case to case, depending upon its facts.

[30]. From the summary of the law relating to rigors of S.37 of NDPS Act, while granting bail involving commercial quantities, the following fundamental principles emerge:

(a). In case of inconsistency, S. 37 of the NDPS Act prevails over S. 439 CrPC. [Narcotics Control Bureau v Kishan Lal, 1991 (1) SCC 705, Para 6].

(b). The limitations on granting of bail come in only when the question of granting bail arises on merits. [Customs, New Delhi v. AhmadalievaNodira, (2004) 3 SCC 549, Para 7].

(c). The provisions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act provide the legal norms which have to be applied in determining whether a case for grant of bail has been made out. [UOI v. Prateek Shukla, **2021:INSC:165 [Para 11]**, (2021) 5 SCC 430, Para 12].

(d). In case the Court proposes to grant bail, two conditions are to be mandatorily satisfied in addition to the standard requirements under the provisions of the CrPC or any other enactment. [Union of India v. Niyazuddin SK &Anr, **2017:INSC:686 [Para 7]**, (2018) 13 SCC 738, Para 7].

(e). Apart from granting opportunity to the Public Prosecutor, the other twin conditions which really have relevance are the Court's satisfaction that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence. [N.R. Mon v. Md. Nasimuddin, (2008) 6 SCC 721, Para 9].

(f). The satisfaction contemplated regarding the accused being not guilty has to be more than prima facie grounds, considering substantial probable causes for believing and justifying that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence. [Customs, New Delhi v. Ahmadalieva Nodira, (2004) 3 SCC 549, Para 7].

(g). The reasonable belief contemplated in the provision requires existence of such facts and circumstances as are sufficient in themselves to justify satisfaction that the accused is not guilty of the alleged offence. [State of Kerala v. Rajesh, **2020:INSC:88 [Para 21]**, AIR 2020 SC 721, Para 21].

(h). Twin conditions of S. 37 are cumulative and not alternative. [Customs, New Delhi v. Ahmadalieva Nodira, (2004) 3 SCC 549, Para 7].

(i). At the bail stage, it is neither necessary nor desirable to weigh the evidence meticulously to arrive at a positive finding as to whether or not the accused has committed an offence under the NDPS Act and further that he is not likely to commit an offence under the said Act while on bail. [Union of India v. Rattan Mallik @ Habul, (2009) 2 SCC 624, Para 14].

(j). If the statements of the prosecution witnesses are believed, then they would not result in a conviction. [Babua v. State of Orissa, (2001) 2 SCC 566, Para 3].

(k). Merely recording the submissions of the parties does not amount to an indication of a judicial mind or a judicious application of mind. [UOI v. Prateek Shukla, **2021:INSC:165 [Para 11]**, (2021) 5 SCC 430, Para 12].

(l). Section 37 departs from the long-established principle of presumption of innocence in favour of an accused person until proved otherwise. [Union of India v. Sanjeev v. Deshpande, (2014) 13 SCC 1, Para 5].

(m). While considering the application for bail concerning Section 37, the Court is not called upon to record a finding of not guilty. [Union of India v. Shiv Shanker Kesari, (2007) 7 SCC 798, Para 11].

(n). The confessional statement recorded under Section 67 of the NDPS Act is inadmissible in the trial of an offence under the NDPS Act. [Tofan Singh v. State of Tamil Nadu, **2020:INSC:620**, (2021) 4 SCC 1]

(o). In the absence of clarity on the quantitative analysis of the samples from the laboratory, the prosecution cannot be heard to state at this preliminary stage that the accused possessed a commercial quantity of psychotropic substances as contemplated under the NDPS Act. [Bharat Chaudhary v. Union of India **2021:INSC:877 [Para 11]**, 2021 SCC OnLine SC 1235, Para 10].

(p). When there is evidence of conscious possession of commercial quantity of psychotropic substances, such accused is not entitled to bail given Section 37 of the Act as contemplated under the NDPS Act. [State by (NCB) Bengaluru v. Pallulabid Ahmad Arimutta, **2022:INSC:26 [Para 11]**, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 47, Para 12].

(p). Bail must be subject to stringent conditions. [Sujit Tiwari v. State of Gujarat, **2020:INSC:101 [Para 12]**, 2020 SCC Online SC 84, Para 12].

[31]. Satisfying the fetters of S. 37 of the NDPS Act is candling the infertile eggs. The stringent conditions of section 37 placed in the statute by the legislature do not create a bar for bail for specified categories, including the commercial quantity; however, it creates hurdles by placing a reverse burden on the accused, and once crossed, the rigors no more subsist, and the factors for bail become similar to the bail petitions under general penal statutes like IPC.

18. The petitioner claims to have joined the investigation.

19. In *Roji alias Dimpi v. State of Punjab*, SLP (Crl.) 8976-2023, decided on 13-09-2023, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds,

The petitioner is accused of committing the offence punishable under Sections 21(a) and 21(b) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act; based on the statement of the co-accused from whom a commercial quantity (274 grams) of contraband was seized. Aside from the statement of that co-accused – who implicated the petitioner by alleging that he had sold 126 grams to her, in fact there is no other material on the record. The prosecution, prima facie seems to rely entirely upon the statement of the co-accused and the recovery of the 274 grams from him.

It is a matter of record that the petitioner had joined the investigations and has cooperated in that regard.

Having regard to all these circumstances, this Court is satisfied that the petitioner should be granted anticipatory bail and is accordingly directed to be enlarged on anticipatory bail subject to such terms as the Trial Court may impose.

20. The law of bail, like any other branch of law, has its own philosophy, and occupies an important place in the administration of justice and the concept of bail emerges from the conflict between the police power to restrict liberty of a man who is alleged to have committed a crime, and presumption of innocence in favour of the alleged criminal.¹ Personal liberty is a very precious fundamental right and it should be curtailed only when it becomes imperative according to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case.² Personal liberty deprived when bail is refused, is too precious a value of our constitutional system recognised under Art. 21 that the curial power to negate it is a great trust exercisable, not casually, but judicially with lively concern for the cost to the individual and the community.³

21. The evidence collected might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or even to frame the charges; however, for the purpose of bail, the evidence is denying insufficient.

22. Given the penal provisions invoked, the legal admissibility of evidence collected against the petition, coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations, and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or pre-trial incarceration, subject to compliance with the terms and conditions mentioned in this order.

CONDITIONS:

¹ Supreme Court of India in *Vaman Narain Ghiya v. state of Rajasthan*, [E-SCR] ; [2008] 17 SCR 369, Para 16, decided on 12.12.2008.

² Supreme Court of India in *Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra*, SC 2J [E-SCR], Paragraph 127, decided on 02.12.2010.

³ Supreme Court of India in *Babu Singh & ors v. State of UP*, [E-SCR] P. 777, decided on 31.01.1978.

23. Given the above, without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for anticipatory bail. This order shall come into force from the time it is uploaded on this Court's official webpage.

24. The investigation indicates that the petitioner is not the main accused, so the petitioner's bail shall not be treated as a precedent for granting bail to the other co-accused with a higher role.

25. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, and if the matter is before a Court, then the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Officer/Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

26. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

27. This order is subject to the petitioner's complying with the following terms.

28. The petitioner is directed to join the investigation within seven days of uploading this order on the official webpage of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and as and when called by the Investigator. The petitioner shall be in deemed custody for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act. The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as required. In the event of failure to do so, the prosecution will be open to seeking cancellation of the bail. During the investigation, the petitioner shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

29. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

30. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect the members of society, detention squad and incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report or discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearms. [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of the evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond a reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be construed as an intermediate sanction]. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days from today and inform the Investigator of the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and reclaim them in case of acquittal in this case, provided it is otherwise permissible under the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in the victim(s), their families, and society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

31. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavor to reform and ensure the accused does not repeat the offense and also to block the menace of drug abuse. In *Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi*, 2022:INSC:735 [Para 28], Writ Petition (Criminal) No 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court holds that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts, while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed."

32. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offense in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes a maximum sentence that is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above; then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days, providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

33. In *Md. Tajiur Rahaman v. The State of West Bengal*, decided on 08-Nov-2024, SLP (Crl) 12225-2024, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds in Para 7, "It goes without saying that if the petitioner is found involved in such like offence in future, the concession of bail granted to him today will liable to be withdrawn and the petitioner is bound to face the necessary consequences."

34. This bail is conditional, with the foundational condition being that if the petitioner

repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, or commits any offence under the NDPS Act, where the quantity involved is more than half of the intermediate, or commercial, or violates S. 19, or 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, the State shall file an application to revoke this bail before the Special Judge/ Sessions Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and as per their discretion, they may cancel this bail.

35. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

36 It is clarified that this bail order shall not be considered as a blanket bail order in any other matter and is only limited to granting bail in the FIR mentioned above.

36. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Appellant-Accused can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

37. Petition allowed in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

25.09.2025
renubala

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.