



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

104

CRM-M-27322-2025

Date of decision: 07.07.2025

Varinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Impinder Singh Dhaliwal, 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.138 dated 01.05.2025 under Sections 21-B/61/85 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, 'the NDPS Act') (Section 27-A of the NDPS Added lateron), registered at Police Station City Dabwali, District Sirsa.

2. It has been asserted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of a disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Kashmir Singh from whom a recovery of 50 grams of heroin was allegedly made. It has been vehemently argued by the learned counsel that the disclosure statement on the basis of which the petitioner has been made an accused in the present case, holds poor evidentiary value and, therefore, the petitioner deserves to be enlarged on anticipatory bail.



CRM-M-27322-2025

3. On being pointedly asked as to whether the petitioner has any previous criminal antecedents, learned counsel has submitted that on a previous occasion, the petitioner was convicted for an offence under the NDPS Act, however, in the said case also, no recovery of any contraband was made from the petitioner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On asking of the Court, Mr. Rahul Mohan, Addl. A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has submitted that the petitioner has withheld his involvement in a number of cases under the NDPS Act. It has been submitted by the learned State counsel that it is a matter of record that there are two other cases pending against the petitioner under the NDPS Act, including one case in which he stands convicted. It has, therefore, been submitted that it is evident that the petitioner is a habitual offender, who does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail, moreso in view of the drug menace prevailing in this part of the country.

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

8. Prima facie, the petitioner indeed comes across as a habitual offender. The petitioner is the alleged supplier of the recovered contraband. The petitioner, therefore, does not deserve the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail. The instant petition



CRM-M-27322-2025

stands dismissed accordingly.

9. 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.

07.07.2025

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

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