


2025:PHHC:009378



IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

219

CRM-M-395-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 22.01.2025

Lakhbir Singh @ Lakhi ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. D. S. Virk, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*for short* 'BNSS'), is for grant of anticipatory
bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 304 dated 16.09.2024, registered
under Section 15(b) and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances
Act, 1985 (*for short* 'NDPS Act') at Police Station Kalanwali, District Sirsa.
2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the disposal of the present
petition are that on 16.09.2024, co-accused Bhushan Singh @ Pusha was
apprehended by the police party and recovery of 02 kgs. and 60 grams of
poppy husk was effected from him. He was formally arrested at the spot. On
interrogation, the above named co-accused disclosed that the recovered
contraband was given to him by the present petitioner for selling on
commission basis. On the basis of the same, the petitioner has been nominated
in this case. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application

2025:PHHC:009378



for grant of anticipatory bail before the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa but the same had been dismissed, vide order dated 12.11.2024.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner was not found at the spot and has been involved in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the co-accused, which is not admissible in law against him. Even otherwise, the quantity of the recovery contraband is of non-commercial quantity. The petitioner is ready to join the investigation. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him into custody. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed. To fortify his argument, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the authority of Hon'ble Supreme Court rendered in ***Tofan Singh vs. State of Tamil Nadu : (2021) 4 SCC 1.***

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. It is submitted therein and learned Senior Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that though the petitioner has been nominated in this case on the basis of the disclosure suffered by the co-accused but during the course of investigation, his complicity in the subject crime has been duly established. The petitioner had supplied the recovered contraband to the co-accused for selling the same to others. He is involved in one more case under the NDPS Act. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must for proper investigation in the matter as well as for effecting further recovery of contraband, if any. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have also perused the material placed on record.


6. The petitioner has been nominated in this case on the basis of the

2025:PHHC:009378



disclosure made by co-accused Bhushan Singh @ Pusha, who was apprehended by the police party on 16.09.2024 and from whose custody, recovery of 02 kgs. and 60 grams of poppy husk was effected. The allegation against the petitioner is that he had supplied the recovered contraband to the above named co-accused. The petitioner is stated to be involved in one more case under the NDPS Act. In order to know the source of contraband and for effecting recovery of the contraband, if any, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. So far as the ratio of law as laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Tofan Singh*'s case (supra) is concerned, the same stands clarified by Hon'ble Supreme Court in *State of Haryana vs. Samarth Kumar : 2022(3) RCR (Criminal) 991*, wherein it has been held that the advantage of decision of *Tofan Singh*'s case (supra) can be taken in regular bail application or at the time of final hearing after conclusion of trial and not while seeking concession of pre-arrest bail. The well settled proposition of law is that while considering an application for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to consider the nature of the offence, the role of the person, the likelihood of his influencing the course of investigation or tampering with evidence including intimidating witnesses. The powers under Section 482 of BNSS are to be exercised in extraordinary and sparing circumstances. More so, custodial interrogation of a suspected person is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favourable order under Section 482 of BNSS. Many useful information can be disinterred during custodial interrogation. It has also to be seen that an order of anticipatory bail does not operate as inroad in the normal legal procedure of criminal cases by the trial Court. It is also a matter of discretion to grant or not

2025:PHHC:009378



to grant pre-arrest bail. Keeping in view the discussion as made above, I am of the considered opinion that no extraordinary or sparing circumstance entitling the petitioner to seek concession of pre-arrest bail has been made out rather his custodial interrogation is required for thorough investigation in the matter by the police. Accordingly, finding no merit, the petition is dismissed.

7. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

22.01.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No