



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

**223**

CRM-M-26219-2025  
Date of decision: 22.07.2025

Salim Teji alias Saleem

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H. S. GREWAL**

\*\*\*\*\*

Present : Mr. L.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**H. S. GREWAL, J.(ORAL)**

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.129 dated 05.06.2025, under Sections 21(c) of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Kalanwali, Police District Dabwali, District Sirsa.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the petitioner is that the recovery of 292 grams 96 miligrams of heroin was allegedly effected from Akashdeep Singh @ Janni, who in his disclosure statement, had named Salim s/o Mauji r/o Dhan Mohalla, Ferozepur. Learned counsel, however, submits that the present petitioner is Salim Teji @ Saleem s/o Salwinder Singh, r/o Janta Preet Nagar, Ferozepur City, Tehsil and District Ferozepur. Therefore, it is stated that it is case of mis-identity and the petitioner has wrongly been arraigned in the present FIR.

3. Learned State counsel has filed the reply by way of affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Kalanwali, District Sirsa dated 19.07.2025, which is taken on record. A perusal of the reply reveals that the petitioner is the same person, who has been named by the co-accused Akashdeep Singh



in his disclosure statement as seller of the alleged contraband. It is further stated that on 16.07.2025, account statement of account No.00741000930806 of co-accused Akashdeep Singh was taken in possession from Punjab and Sindh Bank, as per which, there is funds transfer of total Rs.60,000/- on 31.05.2025 and 01.06.2025 from the account of co-accused Akashdeep Singh to the petitioner through UPI. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that the contraband recovered from the co-accused falls under the ambit of commercial quantity and therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary as source of the recovered heroin is to be traced out from him and Rs.2,35,000/- (i.e. Rs.1,75,000/- received in cash and Rs.60,000/- received through UPI) earned by him by selling the same is yet to be recovered from him.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. In view of the submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner as the custodial interrogation is essential for proper investigation in this case.

6. Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

7. However, it is made clear that the observations made hereinabove would not have any bearing on the merits of the case.

**(H. S. GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**22.07.2025**

Hemant

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