



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

144

CRM-M-70088-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.03.2026

Udai Lal Dangi

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Tejas Ahlawat, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. B.S. Saroha, DAG Haryana

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.155 dated 18.04.2024, registered under Section 15(c) of NDPS Act at Police Station City Mandi, Dabwali.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for 7 months and 13 days. His name surfaced based on the disclosure statement of co-accused Gobind Singh, who was also named in the disclosure statement of one Hoshiyar, whose name was also disclosed by 3 other co-accused, from whom the alleged recovery of 140 of poppy husk was effected. The petitioner is not owner of the truck, which is involved in the present case, though owns one. No recovery has been effected from him. Similar circumstanced co-accused Gobind Singh, Hoshiyar Singh, Parveen Kumar & Hardeep Singh @ Happy have been granted regular bail by this Court, vide Annexure P-2 (Colly). Charges have been framed on 23.10.2025, however, out of 16 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined. The petitioner is involved in 1 more case



under NDPS Act, registered just a day after his implication in the present case as also 7 under IPC & 1 under Excise act. Reliance is placed on the judgment passed by Hon'ble The Supreme Court titled as **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations against the petitioner levelled by his co-accused. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to custody, stage and co-accused having been granted bail.

4. Heard.

5. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (Supra) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court, etc." Reiterating in **Prabhakar Tewari vs. State of UP and another**, (2020) 11 SCC 648, it was observed that, "The offence alleged no doubt is grave and serious and there are several criminal cases pending against the accused. These factors by themselves cannot be the basis for refusal of prayer for bail."

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 7 months and 13 days; co-accused are on bail; charges were framed on 23.10.2025, however, the prosecution evidence is yet to commence and in all there are 16 PWs, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be



violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

7. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

8. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.



9. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

27.03.2026

M.Kamra

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