



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

241-2

CRM-M-18361 of 2025
Date of decision: 21.07.2025

Raghunandan Yadav

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Saurabh Sharma, 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.906 dated 13.11.2024, under Section 18 (Sections 18B, 27A and 29 added later on) of the NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Shahabad District Kurukshetra.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that co-accused Mohammad Shubhan and Akashdeep were arrested and found in possession of 3 Kg.200 Gram of Opium from the truck bearing No.PB-13BA-0117. Petitioner was named in the disclosure statement made by his co-accused Mohammad Shubhan while he was in custody.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was falsely implicated in the present case because apart from the disclosure statement of the co-accused, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner from the said contraband. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 08 months and 01 day as under trial. Trial is likely



to take time for its conclusion and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, petitioner be released on regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. 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 the last 08 months and 01 day.

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

7. 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 apart from disclosure statement there is no other evidence on record to connect the petitioner to the contraband, 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.

8. 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 her furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.



9. 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