

2025:PHHC:065720



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

136

CRM-M-26877-2025

Date of decision: May 16, 2025

JAGJEET SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Ms. Manjot Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.33 dated 12.04.2025 under Section 18 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (and Sections 27 and 29 of the NDPS Act added later on), registered at Police Station Khanauri, District Sangrur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case, which arises out of the recovery of 750 grams of opium allegedly made from the possession of co-accused Balraj. It is contended that the only material connecting the petitioner to the present offence is the disclosure statement of co-accused Balraj, which, it is argued, holds little evidentiary value.

3. It is further submitted that the prosecution has not brought forth any independent or corroborative evidence to demonstrate that the petitioner was involved in the commission of the alleged offence or that any secret



information was received regarding his active participation in drug trafficking activities along with the co-accused.

4. Upon being specifically questioned as to whether the petitioner has any previous criminal antecedents, it was candidly admitted that the petitioner is involved in five other criminal cases, including four under the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985. Nonetheless, it is argued on behalf of the petitioner that in each of those cases, he has been falsely implicated.

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

6. On consideration of the submissions made and the material on record, this Court finds that although disclosure statements, *per se*, may carry limited evidentiary value, the petitioner's involvement in multiple criminal cases under the NDPS Act cannot be ignored. The petitioner was admittedly on bail in the said cases when his name surfaced yet again in the present matter. This involvement in NDPS offences *prima facie* indicates a propensity to engage in similar illegal activities.

7. Moreover, at the current stage of investigation, this Court does not find sufficient grounds to disregard the link established between the petitioner and the present offence, however tenuous the evidentiary thread may appear.

8. In the light of the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, and particularly considering the petitioner's criminal



antecedents and the nature of the present allegations, this Court does not deem it to be a fit case for grant of extraordinary concession bail.

9. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

10. 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.

May 16, 2025

Jaspreet Kaur

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*