



212

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-43836-2025

Date of Decision: 29.10.2025

AMRIK SINGH ALIAS VICKY

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Ms. Rashi Verma, Advocate for  
Mr. Manu Loona, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab  
assisted by ASI Radhe Shyam.

\*\*\*\*

**YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)**

1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.153 dated 12.06.2025, registered under Sections 21(c) NDPS Act at Police Station Sadar Fazilka, District Fazilka (Annexure P-1).

2. On 26.08.2025, the following order was passed:-

*“Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.153 dated 12.06.2025, registered under Sections 21(c) NDPS Act at Police Station Sadar Fazilka, District Fazilka (Annexure P-1).*

*Status report by way of an affidavit of Lavdeep Singh Gill, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Fazilka-cum-Sub Division, Fazilka filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.*

*As per prosecution case, two persons travelling on a motorcycle were apprehended by the police on 12.06.2025*



*and they disclosed their names as Gurpreet Singh @ Gori and Surjeet Singh @ Bobby and 254 gms of heroin was recovered from the possession of Gurpreet Singh and 20 grams of heroin was recovered from accused Surjeet Singh. On interrogation, Gurpreet Singh disclosed that petitioner Amrik Singh, who is his brother, had supplied the contraband to him. Apprehending arrest, petitioner has applied for anticipatory bail which has been rejected by the trial Court.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Gurpreet Singh which is not admissible in evidence. There is no other material to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence and disclosure statement alone cannot be made the basis to deny the benefit of anticipatory bail. Learned counsel next contended that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and he will abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court. In support of her contentions, learned counsel for the petitioner has cited the Judgment reported as Law Finder Doc.id# 2687409, 2025:NCPHHC:2121 titled as **“Sahil Joshi Vs. State of Punjab”***

*On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential to find out the source from where the contraband was arranged. Petitioner is involved in another case under NDPS Act and he was on bail in that case and petitioner has thus misused the concession of bail in the previous FIR and he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.*

*Adjourned to 08.10.2025. Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall abide by the terms and*

*conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS, 2023.*”

3. Today, on instructions from ASI Radhe Shyam, learned State counsel has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 26.08.2025 and is no longer required for further investigation.

4. In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 26.08.2025, whereby the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute. However, he shall continue to join investigation, if and so required by the Investigating Officer.

5. Disposed of.

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

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)  
JUDGE

29.10.2025  
*Ali*

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | Yes/No |