



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

(107)

CRM-M-41358-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: **28.07.2026**

NARINDER PAL

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

-.-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. Angrej Singh, Advocate along with
Mr. Mandeep Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasjit Singh Rattu, DAG, Punjab.

-.-

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The present is the first petition instituted under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973), seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 137 dated 26.04.2026, registered under Sections 21(c) and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, at Police Station Sadar, Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.

2. Briefly stated, the prosecution case is that while the police party was conducting nakabandi, patrolling and routine checking, two motorcycle riders, namely Kulwinder Singh and Jagdev Singh, were intercepted. Upon search of the toolbox of the motorcycle, 300 grams of heroin was allegedly recovered. During the course of investigation, co-accused Jagdev Singh allegedly suffered a disclosure statement and



subsequently got recovered a further quantity of 1 kilogram and 583 grams of heroin from his house. The present petitioner was thereafter nominated as an accused primarily on the basis of the disclosure statements allegedly suffered by the co-accused, wherein it was stated that the petitioner had supplied the contraband to Kulwinder Singh and Jagdev Singh. Consequently, the petitioner was implicated under Section 29 of the NDPS Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was neither apprehended at the spot nor was any contraband recovered from his possession. It is submitted that, apart from the disclosure statements allegedly suffered by the co-accused, there is no independent or corroborative material connecting the petitioner with the alleged recovery. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner undertakes to join and cooperate with the investigation as and when required, shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence or influence any witness, and shall faithfully abide by any condition imposed by this Court. It is further argued that the entire alleged contraband has already been recovered and, therefore, no custodial interrogation of the petitioner is warranted. Accordingly, it is prayed that the present petition be allowed and the petitioner be granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Jasjit Singh Rattu, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail. Having regard to the commercial



quantity of the contraband allegedly involved and the seriousness of the allegations, it is prayed that the present petition be dismissed.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at length and have meticulously perused the paper book and the material placed on record with their able assistance.

7. It is not in dispute that an initial recovery of 300 grams of heroin was allegedly effected from the possession of the co-accused. During the course of investigation, co-accused Jagdev Singh is stated to have suffered a disclosure statement, pursuant to which a further quantity of 1 kilogram and 583 grams of heroin was allegedly recovered from his house. The present applicant-petitioner was subsequently nominated as an accused on the basis of the disclosure statements allegedly suffered by the co-accused, wherein he has been attributed the specific role of having supplied the entire alleged contraband, aggregating to 1 kilogram and 883 grams of heroin.

7.1. Having regard to the substantial quantity of the contraband allegedly involved, which falls within the ambit of commercial quantity, the seriousness and gravity of the accusations, and the specific role attributed to the petitioner as the alleged supplier, the matter cannot be viewed merely as an isolated instance of recovery. The allegations, prima facie, indicate the possible existence of a larger network involved in the procurement, transportation and distribution of narcotic substances. The investigation is, therefore, required to ascertain the source from which the contraband was allegedly procured, the manner in which it was transported and supplied, the identity of other persons who may be connected with the



alleged narcotic operation, and the extent of the petitioner's purported involvement therein.

7.2. At this stage, the investigation is required to be afforded a fair and meaningful opportunity to trace the alleged source and supply chain of the contraband and to unearth the wider ramifications, if any, of the alleged narcotic network. The custodial interrogation of the applicant-petitioner is, therefore, considered necessary for the purpose of conducting an effective and comprehensive investigation, including confronting him with the material collected during the course of investigation and eliciting information regarding the alleged procurement, supply and distribution of the contraband. The plea that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner, by itself, is not sufficient to warrant the grant of anticipatory bail, particularly when the petitioner has been attributed a specific role as the alleged supplier of a substantial commercial quantity of heroin.

7.3. In the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, and having due regard to the rigour of Section 37 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, this Court is not persuaded to hold, at this stage, that the petitioner has made out a case for the exercise of the discretionary jurisdiction relating to the grant of anticipatory bail. The petitioner has failed to demonstrate the existence of any exceptional circumstance warranting the grant of pre-arrest protection.

7.4. Consequently, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, lest it prejudice either side during the course of investigation or trial, the present petition, being devoid of merit, is hereby **dismissed**.



8. By virtue of the final determination of the main cause, all pending interlocutory and ancillary applications stand automatically disposed of. The final adjudication of the core controversy has effectively extinguished the substratum of these pending applications, rendering them infructuous and precluding the need for separate judicial intervention or formal orders.

28.07.2026
Gaurav Sorot

(**VIRINDER AGGARWAL**)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned / speaking?	Yes / No
Whether reportable?	Yes / No