

2025:PHHC:085841



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

105

**CRM-M-35364-2025
Decided on:08.07.2025**

Ranjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bhardwaj

Present: Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 438 Cr.PC for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.127 dated 16.05.2025, registered under Sections 21/21-C/23/25/27-A/29 of the NDPS Act, 1985, at Police Station Islamabad, District Amritsar.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the police party, while patrolling on 16.05.2025, received a secret information to the effect that Akashdeep Singh S/o Kuldeep Singh and Akashdeep Singh S/o Hardev Singh, in connivance with their accomplices, are involved in cross-border smuggling of heroin via drones and now they are present near Prem Nagar Bhatha, Bohari Sahib waiting for a customer and if a raid is conducted, they can be apprehended and huge amount of heroin can be recovered from them. On receiving the aforesaid secret information, the police party out looked the place disclosed and then they apprehended both Akashdeep Singh and recovered 01 Kg 14 grams of heroin from them. On registered of the FIR, the investigation commenced and during investigation, the complicity of the petitioner was found and, thus, he was arrayed as an accused. Apprehending arrest, he

2025:PHHC:085841



approached the Court of the Addl. Sessions Judge, Amritsar for grant of concession of anticipatory bail, however, after hearing both the sides, the said relief was declined to him vide order dated 04.06.2025. Hence, aggrieved against the said order, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that neither the petitioner is named in the FIR nor any recovery has been effected from him. However, he has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused, from whom 01 Kg 14 grams of heroin was allegedly recovered and another co-accused has been found in possession of drug money of Rs.3,10,000/-. It is submitted that the disclosure statement of co-accused is not admissible in evidence. He submits that even no *prima facie* case, as alleged, is made out against the petitioner and, thus, he deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On asking of the Court, Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and has vehemently opposed the bail application and it has been submitted that during investigation conducted so far, the complicity of the petitioner has been found and, thus, for the free and fair investigation, his custodial interrogation is essential for unravelling the truth. He further submits that the recovery in the present case from co-accused is of 01 Kg 14 grams of heroin, which is a heavy commercial quantity and thus, the bar under Section 37 of the NDPS Act, 1985 is attracted. He, thus, submitted that the present petition, being devoid of merit, deserves to be dismissed.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the available record, it is deciphered that the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused and the

2025:PHHC:085841



Court cannot ignore the fact that the recovery effected from the co-accused is of 01 Kg 14 grams of heroin and of Rs.3,10,000/-. Since the recovery effected of heroin falls within the category of commercial quantity, therefore, bar under Section 37 of the NDPS is attracted in the present case. The contentions raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner cannot be appreciated at this stage where he has approached this Court for the grant of concession of anticipatory bail. However, the same could be appreciated at the relevant stage.

7. For the consideration of anticipatory bail, the statutory parameters are given under Section 482 (1) & (2) of BNSS which reads as under:-

“482. Direction for grant of bail to person apprehending arrest:

1. *When any person has reason to believe that he may be arrested on an accusation of having committed a non-bailable offence, he may apply to the High Court or the Court of Session for a direction under this section; and that Court may, if it thinks fit, direct that in the event of such arrest, he shall be released on bail.*
2. *When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including*
 - (i) *a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
 - (ii) *a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
 - (iii) *a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;*
 - (iv) *such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.”*

2025:PHHC:085841



8. Hon'ble Supreme Court in State represented by **CBI Vs. Anil Sharma**, (1997) 7 SCC 187 has held as under:-

“6. We find force in the submission of the CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconded with a favorable order under Section 438 of the code. In a case like this effective interrogation of suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful informations and also materials which would have been concealed. Succession such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail during the time he interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The court has to presume that responsible Police Officers would conduct themselves in task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders.”

9. Hon'ble Apex Court in plethora of judicial precedents including **Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab, AIR 1980 SC 1632**, has time and again reiterated that while considering the anticipatory bail the Court is to take into consideration the factors like gravity of offence, chances of accused tampering with the evidence and probabilities of his fleeing from justice etc. The Court should be circumspect about the impact of its decision on the society as well. The anticipatory bail is an extraordinary discretion which should be exercised in the extraordinary circumstances.

10. The petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of anticipatory bail, however, Hon'ble Supreme Court in **The State of Haryana vs. Samarth Kumar, 2022 Livelaw (SC) 622** has held that in the cases like the present one, the accused may take advantage of facts like no recovery was effected from him and that he was implicated on the basis of disclosure

2025:PHHC:085841



statement made by the main accused, at the time of arguing regular bail application or at the time of final hearing after conclusion of trial.

11. Weighing the facts of the case on the anvil of the law settled, it is apparent that the complicity of the petitioner has been *prima facie* established. The investigation is at its threshold. Thus, granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage would scuttle the ongoing investigation.

12. In view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner do not qualify for exercising the extraordinary power by this Court in his favour. Resultantly, the present petition, being devoid of any merit, is hereby dismissed.

13. Nothing said herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

July 08, 2025
vinod*

(Rajesh Bhardwaj)
Judge

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: NO/YES
Whether Reportable: NO/YES