



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

101

CRM-M-4020-2025

Date of decision: 24.02.2025

Sanjeev @ Seepu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Piyush Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.132 dated 24.08.2021 under Sections 21, 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, 'the NDPS Act'), registered at Police Station Bhikhi, District Mansa.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even as per the case of the prosecution the petitioner was not apprehended at the spot along with co-accused Bhajan Kaur from whom a recovery of 20 grams of heroin was allegedly made; during interrogation of co-accused Bhajan Kaur, she allegedly suffered a disclosure statement nominating two other persons Baldev Raj @ Debu and Gurbinder Singh @ Guru as being the suppliers of the recovered contraband. When co-accused Baldev Raj @ Debu and Gurbinder Singh @ Guru were arrested, a recovery of 300 grams of heroin was allegedly effected from them. Learned counsel submits that on the basis of a disclosure statement



CRM-M-4020-2025

allegedly suffered by co-accused Baldev Raj @ Debu and Gurbinder Singh @ Guru, the petitioner was falsely implicated in the present case as being the supplier of the recovered contraband. Learned counsel has submitted that the disclosure statement on the basis of which the petitioner has been nominated as an accused in the present case holds extremely weak evidentiary value and thus, the petitioner deserves to be extended the concession of anticipatory bail.

3. On a pointed query put to the learned counsel for the petitioner as to whether the petitioner has any previous criminal antecedents, he has fairly conceded that the petitioner stands booked in three other criminal cases under the NDPS Act and furthermore, concededly he was on bail in all the three cases registered against him under the NDPS Act.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the relevant material on record.

5. No doubt, the disclosure statements do not hold much evidentiary value, however, in the totality of the circumstances of the present case wherein admittedly the petitioner is involved in a number of other cases under the NDPS Act, it *prima facie* points to his involvement in the drug trafficking.

6. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The instant petition stands dismissed accordingly.

7. However, it is made clear that anything observed



CRM-M-4020-2025

hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

24.02.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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