



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

103

CRM-M-41470-2025 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 19.08.2025

KULDEEP SINGH @ KEEPA

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr.P.S. Sekhon, Advocate for the petitioner(s).
Mr. J.S. Rattu, DAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. **Prayer**

This petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 13 dated 26.02.2025 registered under Section 22-C and 29 of The Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at P.S. Bajakhana, District Faridkot.

2. **Contentions**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner has strenuously contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, solely on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the co-accused. It is submitted that the alleged recovery of 550 tablets of



Tramadol and 560 tablets of Alprazolam in loose form, was effected from the possession of the co-accused, and not from the petitioner himself. The counsel has further emphasized that the strips of Tramadol tablets, as seized, did not bear any batch numbers or expiry dates, which casts a serious doubt on the genuineness of the recovery. It has also been brought to the notice of the Court that the expiry dates and batch numbers were subsequently erased, though it remains unclear by whom such erasure was carried out.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating officer.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State

Learned State Counsel appearing on advance notice on instructions from Investigating officer vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of concession of anticipatory bail stating that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the supply chain of the contraband, however, he is not in a position to controvert the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. Analysis

Be that as it may, the Court observes that the implication of the petitioner in the present case rests solely upon the disclosure statement of the co-accused, the alleged recovery of 550 tablets of Tramadol and 560 tablets of Alprazolam in loose form, was effected from the possession of the co-accused and not from the petitioner, moreover, the strips of Tramadol tablets so recovered did not contain



any batch numbers or expiry dates, which creates a doubt regarding the authenticity of the recovery added with the fact which is also not disputed by the learned State Counsel that the expiry dates and batch numbers appeared to have been subsequently erased, though it is not clear by whom it was done, is a question which is to be decided by the Trial Court, hence, this Court finds no reason to deny the petitioner the concession of anticipatory bail, wherein the petitioner has bona fide intentions and is willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency within the stipulated time period.

4. **Relief**

Hence, in view of the admitted set of circumstances before this Court, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to him joining investigation and reporting to the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS of which are reproduced below :-

‘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.'

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stand cancelled.

The petition in the aforesaid terms stand allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

19.08.2025
anuradha

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