

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

2025:PHHC:126063



124+245/1

**CRM-M-35381-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 12.09.2025.**

Phumman Singh @ Fumman Singh @ Bittu

...Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

.....

Present: Mr. Ruhani Chadha, Advocate and
Mr. Kashav Chadha, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravneet Singh Lekhi, AAG, Punjab.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. (Oral)

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.59 dated 13.04.2025 under Sections 21 and 22 of NDPS Act (Sections 27-A and 29 of NDPS Act added later on), registered at Police Station Kot Ise Khan, District Moga.

As per prosecution case, FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of secret information. Co-accused Sukhwinder Singh were found in possession of 258 grams of heroin and co-accused Satnam Singh was found in possession of 195 loose intoxicant tablets. The petitioner was nominated as an accused in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused Stnam Singh @ Nishan Singh @ Sana. The petitioner is alleged to be indulging in the trafficking of narcotics.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that alleged recovery of contraband had been effected in the present case from the co-

accused and he is not connected with the offence in the present case in any manner. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Satnam Singh, which is not admissible in law. In support of his contentions, he has placed reliance upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Jugraj Singh Vs. State of Punjab, Criminal Appeal No.3640 of 2025, decided on 20.08.2025. He prayed that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required and he is ready and willing to join the investigation and the present petition be allowed.

Notice was issued in this case on 09.07.2025 and status report was called from the State, which was filed on 19.08.2025 and the same was taken on record.

Learned State counsel has opposed the petition and submitted that the petitioner is indulging in the sale and purchase of heroin. He has been specifically named in the disclosure statement of co-accused and as such he is not entitled to the concession of bail.

Heard.

The name of the petitioner surfaced in the present case, on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Satnam Singh @ Nishan Singh @ Shana. In the disclosure statement, it has been disclosed by the co-accused that the petitioner had been indulging in selling of heroin and intoxicant tablets along with him and other co-accused. He also stated that out of the drug money he had purchased one Cruze Car, silver in colour for Rs.5.5 lakhs and gave it to the petitioner, who happens to be his maternal uncle. He has further stated the heroin recovered from Sukhwinder Singh @ Gurpreet @ Gopi and the intoxicant tablets recovered from him had been

purchased in large quantity by the petitioner and his brother-in-law Shaukeen Singh. So, keeping in view the facts and circumstances in the present case and for conducting of investigation in fair and effective manner and to take it to its logical end, no ground is made for granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed. However, nothing observed herein above shall be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The observations recorded above are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail petition.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

12.09.2025.

Komal

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