



211

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-10778-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 07.08.2025

Vishal alias Locha . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Kartik Gandhi, Advocate for
Mr. Chandan Singh Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Vishal Locha @	151	06.07.2024	21 of the NDPS Act, and Section 29 of the NDPS Act (added later on)	City Jagraon	Ludhiana Rural

2. On 25.02.2025, following order was passed:-

“1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Vishal @ Locha, aged 29 years	151	06.07.2024	21 of the NDPS Act, and Section 29 of the NDPS Act (added later on)	City Jagraon	Ludhiana Rural

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that there is a recovery of 10 grams of heroin from the co-accused namely Sagar, and resultantly, FIR was registered on 06.07.2024.

Counsel for the petitioner further submits that name of the petitioner is not mentioned in the FIR. It is after about two days i.e. on 08.07.2024, disclosure statement of the co-accused is recorded, wherein name of the petitioner has been involved. Said disclosure statement is not admissible in



evidence, and prosecution cannot rely upon such a solitary evidence.

Since, petitioner was earlier involved in four other cases, being already known to the local police, he has been unnecessarily made an accused in the present case to spoil his future career prospects.

3. *Counsel for the petitioner also submits that co-accused of the petitioner namely Ravi Kumar, who is also assigned the similar role in the present case, has already been granted concession of interim anticipatory bail, vide order dated 20.02.2025, passed in CRM-M-9901-2025, which is now posted for its hearing for 22.04.2025.*

Thus, prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. *Notice of motion.*

5. *On advance notice, Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to respond to the submissions addressed by learned counsel opposite, after seeking instructions. And, in case of necessity, to file status report.*

6. *Adjourned to 22.04.2025.*

To be heard with CRM-M-9901-2025.

7. *In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).*

8. *Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.”*

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 25.02.2025, passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by learned counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation on 30.05.2025, by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated



25.02.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7. **Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.**

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

August 07, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*