



208 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-48864-2025

Date of Decision: 12.11.2025

HARPREET SINGH

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. B.S. Bhalla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Amarjit Singh.

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 17.06.2025 registered at Police Station Gate Hakima, District Amritsar, under Sections 22-C, 25 of NDPS Act (Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on).

2. Status report by way of affidavit dated 11.11.2025 of Jaspal Singh, PPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Amritsar filed on behalf of the respondent-State is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

3. On 15.09.2025, 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 case FIR No.153 dated 17.06.2025 registered at Police Station Gate Hakima, District Amritsar, under Sections 22-C, 25 of NDPS Act (Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on).

Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel have been heard and material collected by the police



during investigation has been perused.

*Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 17.06.2025, ASI Major Singh along with police party apprehended co-accused Sourabh on the basis of suspicion in the area of Piru Shah Road near Aman Avenue and recovered 10,000 tablets of Tramadol from his possession. On interrogation, co-accused Sourabh disclosed the name of the petitioner-Harpreet Singh to be the supplier. 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 Sourabh, 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 her 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 name of the petitioner has emerged during investigation and disclosure statement of co-accused Sourabh 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.

*Admittedly, no recovery has been effected from the petitioner and his name has cropped up in the disclosure statement of co-accused Sourabh, from whom 10,000 tablets of Tramadol were recovered. At this stage, there is no other material against the petitioner except disclosure statement of co-accused Sourabh. There are no call details between the petitioner and the co-accused to point out towards his involvement. 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 offence. As such, it is a fit case wherein benefit of anticipatory bail should be extended.*



Adjourned to 12.11.2025 for filing status report. 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.”*

4. Today, learned State counsel has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 15.09.2025 and is no longer required for further investigation.

5. In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 15.09.2025, 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.

6. Disposed of.

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

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

12.11.2025
Priyanka Thakur

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No