



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH  
CRM-M-54168-2025  
Reserved on: 9<sup>th</sup> October, 2025  
Pronounced on: 15<sup>th</sup> October, 2025**

Wasim

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. R. Krishnaamorthi, Advocate with  
Mr. Purushotam, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J :-**

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 948 dated 21.12.2024 registered under Section 20(b)(ii)(c) of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substance Act, 1985 (for short 'NDPS') at Police Station Sector 58, Faridabad.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the allegations that on 21.12.2024, on the basis of a secret information to the effect, that the present petitioner along with co-accused Asha Kaur and Babli Kaur were involved in the business of sale of contraband and on that very day also, they were present near Babe Da Dhaba, village Sikri along with some contraband and were waiting for someone and that they could be apprehended along



with the contraband, a raiding party was immediately formed by ASI Sandeep Kumar. They reached at the informed place. The petitioner and co-accused who were standing there were identified by secret informer. They were apprehended. Requisite notices were issued. The plastic bags were checked and 15 kg and 460 grams of *ganja* was recovered from the bag carried by the petitioner whereas, 15 kg and 330 grams of *ganja* was recovered from the plastic bag carried by accused Asha and 15 kg and 260 grams of *ganja* was recovered from the bag of accused Babli. The same were taken into possession by the police. After completion of necessary investigation and usual formalities, challan was presented in the Court and presently, the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 22.12.2024. The trial is likely to take time as not even a single witness has been examined so far. He does not have any criminal antecedents. The recovery from him is not of commercial quantity of contraband. With these broad submissions, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail. In support of his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon authorities of Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Rabi Prakash vs. State of Odisha, 2023 SCC Online SC 1109, SLP No. 12225 of 2024* titled as *Md. Tajiur Rahaman @ Tajiur Rahaman vs. The State of West Bengal* decided on 28.06.2024, *Dheeraj Kumar Shukla vs. State of Uttar Pradesh, 2023 SCC Online SC 918, SLP No. 7115 of 2024* titled as *Shorabh Khan vs. State of Madhya Pradesh* decided on 02.01.2024, *Ramlal vs. State of Rajasthan, 2024 SCC*



***Online Sc 2594*** and has placed reliance upon the judgments passed by the co-ordinate Benches of this High Court in ***Vivek Kumar @ Dablu vs. State of Haryana*** decided on 08.04.2024, ***Sonu vs. State of Haryana, 2025:PHHC: 069018*** and ***Rahul vs. State of Haryana, 2025:PHHC:086285***.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be released on bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to be found in possession of *ganja*. The recovery which was effected from his possession was 15 kg and 460 grams. He has been in custody since 22.12.2024. No prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Obviously the trial will take considerable time to conclude. In ***Md. Tajiur Rehman's case (supra)***, ***Dheeraj Kumar Shukla's case (supra)*** and ***Sohrab Khan's case (supra)***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had extended benefit of bail to the accused keeping in view the fact that they had no criminal antecedents, the period of their custody as well as the fact that the trial would take time. In ***Sonu's case (supra)*** and ***Rahul's case (supra)***, the Co-ordinate Benches of this High Court had extended benefit of bail to the accused by observing that the trial was likely to take sufficiently long time and that the contraband allegedly recovered from the accused was of marginally higher quantity. Keeping in view the above discussed facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has made out a case for release on bail. Accordingly, the



petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

**[MANISHA BATRA]**  
**JUDGE**

**15<sup>th</sup> October, 2025**

*Parveen Sharma*

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*  
: *Yes / No*