



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-M-47307-2025
Date of decision: 10.11.2025

SATNAM SINGH @ SATTI

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. M.R. Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR. J.(Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.81 dated 17.07.2025 registered at Police Station Purana Shalla, District Gurdaspur, under Sections 21 (b) of NDPS Act (Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on).

2. On 09.09.2025, following order was passed:-

“Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.81 dated 17.07.2025 registered at Police Station Purana Shalla, District Gurdaspur, under Sections 21 (b) of NDPS Act (Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on).

Upon notice, learned State counsel has appeared and opposed the bail application. Both the parties have been heard.

In compliance of order dated 27.08.2025, status report by way of affidavit dated 06.09.2025 of Rajinder Singh Manhas, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Dina Nagar, District Gurdaspur filed on behalf of the State is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.



- 2-

As per prosecution case, on 17.07.2025, ASI Lakhwinder Singh alongwith police party apprehended co-accused Sunita on the basis of suspicion in the area of Tibri Puli Gazikot Nehar and 100 grams of heroin was recovered from her. On interrogation, co-accused Sunita, who is the wife of the petitioner, disclosed the name of the petitioner- Satnam Singh @ Satti. Apprehending arrest, the petitioner applied for anticipatory bail, which has been dismissed by the trial Court.

*Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The disclosure statement of co-accused Sunita, whereby he has been nominated as an accused is inadmissible in evidence and cannot be looked into. 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 and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour. In support of his contentions, learned counsel has cited the Judgment reported as Law Finder Doc.id# 2687409, 2025:NCPHHC:2121 titled as “**Sahil Joshi Vs. State of Punjab**” and order dated 20.08.2025 passed by Hon’ble Supreme Court in Criminal Appeal No.3640/2025 @ SLP (Crl) No.9190/2025 titled as ‘**Jugraj Singh Vs. State of Punjab**’. Learned counsel also placed on file the order dated 03.04.2025 passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-18403-2025 in the aforesaid case vide which bail application of aforesaid Jugraj Singh was rejected.*

On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer and argued that the petitioner is also involved in six other cases under NDPS Act. However, in the present case, the name of the petitioner has emerged during investigation and disclosure statement of co-accused Sunita has pointed towards his role in the present offence indicating his involvement in the illicit drug network and as such, his custodial interrogation is essential to trace the source from where the contraband was arranged and other links of supply and petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail.



- 3-

*Admittedly, no recovery has been effected from the petitioner and he was not named in the FIR. His name has cropped up in the disclosure statement of co-accused Sunita, from whom contraband was recovered. At this stage, there is no other material against the petitioner except disclosure statement of co-accused Sunita. In **Jugraj Singh's case (supra)**, 5kg heroin was recovered along with a sum of Rs.17.50 lakh drug money and main accused had nominated said Jugraj Singh as the supplier and the Hon'ble Supreme Court had ordered his release on anticipatory bail observing that mere disclosure statement is not sufficient to connect him with the alleged occurrence. As such, it is a fit case wherein benefit of anticipatory bail should be extended.*

*Adjourned to **10.11.2025**. 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, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.]:-*

- i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- ii) that the petitioner 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/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
- iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior 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."*

3. Today, on instructions from ASI Gurnam Singh, learned State counsel has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 09.09.2025 and is no longer required for further investigation.

4. In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 09.09.2025, 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.

10.11.2025
amandeep

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No