



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

103

CRM-M-16799-2025

Date of decision: March 27th, 2025

Ranjit Singh @ Noni

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Manoj R. Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.20 dated 26.02.2025 under Sections 21 and 29 of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Sadar Batala, District Gurdaspur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that co-accused Gurbej Singh was allegedly nabbed on suspicion by the police, leading to a recovery of four grams of heroin (small quantity); the petitioner was not accompanying the co-accused at the relevant time. However, subsequently during interrogation of co-accused Gurbej Singh, he allegedly suffered a disclosure statement nominating the petitioner as an accused in the present case and claiming that recovered contraband had been supplied to him by the petitioner. Learned counsel has asserted that the disclosure statement on the basis which the petitioner has been arraigned as an accused has very poor evidentiary value and is inadmissible in evidence. Hence, the petitioner deserves the concession of bail, more so when he is willing to join investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. H.S. Deol, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the State.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail, submitting that the petitioner is actively involved in drug trafficking. On instructions from ASI Baldev Singh, learned State counsel has pointed out that although the petitioner was not physically present with co-accused Gurbej Singh at the time of the alleged recovery, it was the petitioner who had supplied the contraband. Furthermore, it has been brought to the notice of this Court that the petitioner is a habitual offender, as he is already involved in four other cases under the NDPS Act. It has been asserted that it, therefore, leaves no manner of doubt about the petitioner's complicity in the illicit drug trade.

6. Learned State counsel has further contended, on instructions, that the petitioner has abused the concession of bail granted to him in the previous cases, and his custodial interrogation is necessitated to unearth the extent of the drug network. It is, therefore, prayed that the present petitioner be dismissed.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

8. *Prima facie*, the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The fact that this is the fifth case registered against him under the NDPS Act cannot be ignored, as it *prima facie* suggests his habitual involvement in drug-related offences. The gravity of the offence and the antecedents of the petitioner weigh against the grant of anticipatory bail, particularly in view of the settled legal position that

economic and organized crimes, including those under the NDPS Act, require stringent scrutiny when considering a prayer for anticipatory bail.

9. Given the nature of the allegations and the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, this Court is of the considered view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to ascertain the full extent of the alleged drug network. Granting anticipatory bail in such circumstances would, therefore, not be in the interest of justice.

10. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

11. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

March 27th, 2025

Puneet

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : Yes