



216 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-49370-2025
Date of Decision: 03.11.2025

KARAJ SINGH

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Rudresh, Advocate for
Ms. Harpreet Kaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab.
assisted by SI Lakhwinder 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.95 dated 06.05.2025 registered at Police Station Dharamkot, District Moga, under Sections 22/29/61/85 of NDPS Act.

2. Status report by way of affidavit dated 02.11.2025 of Rajesh Thakur, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Dharamkot, District Moga filed on behalf of the State is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

3. On 05.09.2025, the following order was passed:-

“Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.95 dated 06.05.2025 registered at Police Station Dharamkot, District Moga, under Sections 22/29/61/85 of NDPS Act.

The brief facts of the prosecution case are that during patrolling duty in the area of police station Dharamkot, the police apprehended two persons namely Sukhdev Singh @ Kebu and Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi and recovered 45 loose



intoxicant tablets from Sukhdev Singh @ Kebu and 35 loose intoxicant tablets from Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi. During interrogation, co-accused Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi disclosed the name of the petitioner. Apprehending arrest, the petitioner applied for anticipatory bail, which was dismissed by the trial Court.

Notice of motion. Mr. G.S. Dhaliwal, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

*Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The disclosure statement of co-accused Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi, 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 to 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**”*

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 Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi 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 he was not named in the FIR. His name has cropped up in the disclosure statement of co-accused Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi, from whom contraband was recovered. At this stage, there is no other material against the petitioner except disclosure statement of co-accused. There are no call details between the petitioner and the co-accused to point out towards his involvement. As such, it is a case wherein benefit of anticipatory bail should be extended.

*Adjourned to **03.11.2025**. 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. However, the petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS/438(2) Cr.P.C.*



4. Today, on instructions from SI Lakhwinder Singh, learned State counsel has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 05.09.2025 and is no longer required for further investigation.

5. In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 05.09.2025, 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

03.11.2025
Priyanka Thakur

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