



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

296

**CRM-M No.49671 of 2025
Date of decision : 13.11.2025**

Parminderjit Singh @ Raja**Petitioner**
Versus
State of Punjab**Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. M.S. Saini, Advocate, for the petitioner

Mr. Gaurav Gurcharan S. Rai, Senior DAG, Punjab

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 5.9.2025, 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.87 dated 04.08.2025 registered at Police Station Mehtiana, District Hoshiarpur, under Sections 21/29/61/85 of NDPS Act.*
- The brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 04.08.2025, during patrolling duty, the police apprehended a young man, who disclosed his name as Harvinder Singh @ Happy and upon his search, 55 grams of heroin was recovered from him. During interrogation, co-accused Harvinder Singh @ Happy 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 Harvinder Singh @ Happy, 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 Harvinder Singh @ Happy 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 Harvinder Singh @ Happy, 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.'

2. Learned State counsel has filed short reply by way of affidavit of Parneet Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police (Detective), District Hoshiarpur and (on instructions) submits that pursuant to the order dated 5.9.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.



3. In view of the above, the instant petition is allowed. The interim order dated 5.9.2025, passed by this Court is hereby confirmed, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.
4. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.
5. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
6. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

13.11.2025
Ashwanii

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