

CRM-M-51151-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51151-2025
Reserved on: 01.10.2025
Pronounced on: 28.10.2025

Pallo and another ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. D.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
85	13.08.2025	Aur, District SBS Nagar, Punjab	22 of NDPS Act (Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on vide DDR No.8 dated 14.08.2025)

1. The petitioners apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above have come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.

2. Per paragraph 10 of the bail petition and reply, the petitioners have the following criminal antecedents:

Petitioner No.1

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1	87	31.05.2007	21 of NDPS Act	Sadar Nawanshahr
2	144	19.11.2014	21/29 of NDPS Act	Rahon
3	136	31.12.2021	498-A IPC	Sadar Banga
4	75	17.09.2022	21 of NDPS Act	Aur
5	32	29.05.2023	21, 27, 29 of NDPS Act	Aur
6	61	12.10.2023	21, 29 of NDPS Act	Aur

Petitioner No.2

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1	79	05.12.2023	354, 323, 427, 24 IPC	---
2	52	28.06.2022	21 & 29 of NDPS Act	Aur

3. The facts and allegations are taken from the reply filed by the State. On 12-08-2025, based on chance recovery, the Police seized 30 tablets of Alprazolam from the

CRM-M-51151-2025

possession of the main accused Deepak Kumar. The Investigator claims to have complied with all the statutory requirements.

4. During custodial interrogation, the main accused, Deepak Kumar confessed before the Police officer that he had purchased the drugs from the petitioners. Based on such confession before the police, the petitioners were arraigned as accused. Apprehending arrest, they filed for anticipatory bail from the Sessions Court, which denied them bail. Feeling aggrieved, they have invoked the concurrent jurisdiction of this Court under S. 482 BNSS, 2023.

5. The petitioners' counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioners and their family.

6. The petitioners' counsel submits that the petitioners would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioners repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, or commits any offence under the NDPS Act, where the quantity involved is more than half of the intermediate, or commercial quantity, or violates S. 19, or 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioners shall have no objection.

7. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

REASONING:

8. Paragraph 9(a) of the reply reads as follows:

“a) The name and total weight of the drug: That recovery of 30 intoxicating tablets marka ALPRAZOLAM TABLETS L.P 0.5 MG ALTRA SAFE 0.5 and the manufacturing date and expiry date was erased was effected at the spot. The report of Forensic Science Laboratory has not been received till date in this case. Reminders were sent to Forensic Science Laboratory to send the report and the same is still awaiting.”

9. As per paragraph 9(a) of the reply, the contraband is 30 tablets of Alprazolam, which shall certainly fall in intermediate category, if not in Small.

10. Dealing in intermediate quantity of Alprazolam in contravention of the NDPS Act, 1985, constitutes an offense under the following provisions and notifications:

CRM-M-51151-2025

Substance Name	ALPRAZOLAM
Quantity detained	30 Tablets
Punishable U/s	S.22(b)/22(c) of NDPS Act, 1985
Quantity type	Intermediate/Small

Drug's Small & Commercial Qty. suggested by Committee report	
Notification No. & date	Expert Committee Report dated 24.03.1995 & 23.08.2001 (Small and Commercial)

Specified as small & Commercial in S.2(viia) & 2(xxiii) NDPS Act, 1985		
Notification No. & dated	S.O.1055(E)	10/19/2001
-		
Sr. No.	178	
Common Name (Name of Narcotic Drug and Psychotropic Substance (International non-proprietary name (INN)	ALPRAZOLAM	
Other non-proprietary name	*****	
Chemical Name	8-chloro-1-methyl-6-phenyl-4H-s-triazolo[4,3-a][1,4]benzodiazepine	
Small Quantity	< 5 Gram	
Commercial Quantity	> 100 Gram	

Declared as punishable under NDPS Act and as per schedule defined in S.2(xi) & 2(xxiii) NDPS Act, 1985		
Notification No. & dated	NDPS Act, 1985 (61 of 1985), S.O. 821(E)	11/14/1985

Sr. No.	30	
Common Name (Name of Narcotic Drug and Psychotropic Substance (International non-proprietary name (INN)	ALPRAZOLAM	
Other non-proprietary name	*****	
Chemical Name	8-Chloro-1-methyl-6-phenyl-4H-s-triazolo [4, 3-a] [1, 4] benzodiazepine	

CRM-M-51151-2025

11. Quantity allegedly involved in this case is not commercial. Given this, the rigors of S. 37 of the NDPS Act do not apply in the present case.

12. Section 2 (vii-a) of the NDPS Act defines commercial quantity as greater than the quantity specified in the schedule. Section 2 (xxiii-a) defines a small quantity as a quantity less than the quantity specified in the table of the NDPS Act. The remaining quantity falls in an undefined category, generally called an intermediate quantity. All sections in the NDPS Act specify an offence and mention the minimum and maximum sentence, depending upon the quantity of the substance. The commercial quantity mandates a minimum sentence of ten years of imprisonment and a minimum fine of Rupees One hundred thousand, and bail is subject to the riders mandated in S. 37 of the NDPS Act. When the quantity is less than commercial, the restrictions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act will not attract, and the factors for bail become similar to the offence regular statutes.

13. It would be appropriate to refer to the evidence collected against the petition, which is taken from paragraphs 9(c), (d), and (e) of the reply, which reads as follows:

“9(c) The evidence based on which the petitioners were arraigned as an accused: Though the petitioners were not named in FIR but their name was surfaced from the disclosure statement (Annexure R1/T) of their co-accused. The petitioners are habitual offender and criminal cases including the cases under the offences of NDPS Act has already registered against them.

d) The evidence against the petitioners: Though the petitioners were not named in FIR but their name was surfaced from the disclosure statement (Annexure R1/T) of their co-accused. The petitioners are habitual offender and criminal cases including the cases under the offences of NDPS Act has already registered against them.

e) The role of the petitioners: That the petitioners have supplied the recovered intoxicating tablets to accused- Deepak Kumar alias Guri.”

14. Thus, the evidence collected so far consists of disclosure statements. Such statements can be proven subject to the mandatory restrictions imposed in S. 25 & 26 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ S. 23 of BSA, 2023.

15. In *Tofan Singh v. State of Tamil Nadu*, (2021) 4 SCC 1, the majority view of a three-member bench holds as follows:

We answer the reference by stating:

CRM-M-51151-2025

(i) That the officers who are invested with powers under section 53 of the NDPS Act are “police officers” within the meaning of section 25 of the Evidence Act, as a result of which any confessional statement made to them would be barred under the provisions of section 25 of the Evidence Act, and cannot be taken into account in order to convict an accused under the NDPS Act.

(ii) That a statement recorded under section 67 of the NDPS Act cannot be used as a confessional statement in the trial of an offence under the NDPS Act.

16. The status report filed by the police reveals that the investigator arraigned the petitioners as accused based on the disclosure statement of the main accused, from whose possession the investigator had recovered the contraband. No other evidence is collected at this stage to connect the petitioners with the main accused. Thus, there is no justification to deny bail.

17. In *Baldev Singh v. State of Punjab*, SLP (Crl). 2364-2025, decided on 09-07-2025, the Hon’ble Supreme Court holds,

The petitioner before this Court is seeking an anticipatory bail, which was declined by the High Court by an order dated 16.01.2025. The petitioner is an accused for the offences punishable under Section 15B of the NDPS Act and is facing investigation. Vide order dated 09.04.2025, interim protection was granted to the petitioner, subject to cooperation in the investigation. Having considered the entire facts of the matter and the statement made by Ms. Nupur Kumar, learned counsel for the State, we do not think that this is a case where custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. Hence, the order dated 09.04.2025 is made absolute.

18. Pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. The evidence might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or to frame charges, but this Court is not considering the evidence at that stage but is analyzing it for the stage of anticipatory bail. An analysis of the above does not justify custodial interrogation or pre-trial incarceration.

19. The law of bail, like any other branch of law, has its own philosophy, and occupies an important place in the administration of justice and the concept of bail emerges from the conflict between the police power to restrict liberty of a man who is alleged to have committed a crime, and presumption of innocence in favour of the alleged criminal.¹ Personal liberty is a very precious fundamental right and it should be curtailed only when it becomes imperative according to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case.² Personal liberty deprived when bail is refused, is too precious a value of our

¹ Supreme Court of India in *Vaman Narain Ghiya v. state of Rajasthan*, [E-SCR] ; [2008] 17 SCR 369, Para 16, decided on 12.12.2008.

² Supreme Court of India in *Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra*, SC 2J [E-SCR], Paragraph 127, decided on 02.12.2010.

CRM-M-51151-2025

constitutional system recognised under Art. 21 that the curial power to negate it is a great trust exercisable, not casually, but judicially with lively concern for the cost to the individual and the community.³

20. The evidence collected might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or even to frame the charges; however, it is insufficient to deny bail.

21. Given the penal provisions invoked, the legal admissibility of evidence collected against the petition, coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations, and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or pre-trial incarceration.

22. Given the above, without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioners makes a case for anticipatory bail.

23. Given above, provided the petitioners are not required in any other case, the petitioners shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, and if the matter is before a Court, then the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Officer/Court must be satisfied that if the accused fail to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

24. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioners shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

25. The bail order is subject to the petitioners’ complying with the following terms.

26. The petitioners are directed to join the investigation within seven days of uploading this order on the official webpage of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and as and when called by the Investigator. The petitioners shall be in deemed custody for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ Section 23 of BSA, 2023. The petitioners shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as required. In the event of failure to do so, the prosecution will be open to seeking cancellation of the bail. During the investigation, the petitioners shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

ANJU RANI
2025.10.29 09:46
I attest to the accuracy and integrity of this
document
Punjab and Haryana High Court
Chandigarh

³ Supreme Court of India in *Babu Singh & ors v. State of UP*, [E-SCR] P. 777, decided on 31.01.1978.

CRM-M-51151-2025

27. The petitioners shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioners shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

28. Given the background of allegations against petitioners, it becomes paramount to protect the detection squad, members of society, and incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report or discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearms. [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of the evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond a reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be construed as an intermediate sanction]. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioners shall surrender all weapons, firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days from the uploading of this order on the official webpage of this Court and inform the Investigator of the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioners shall be entitled to renew and reclaim them in case of acquittal in this case, provided it is otherwise permissible under the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

29. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offense in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes a maximum sentence that is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above; then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioners notice of a minimum of seven days, providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

30. In *Md. Tajiur Rahaman v. The State of West Bengal*, decided on 08-Nov-2024, SLP (Crl) 12225-2024, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds in Para 7, "It goes without saying that if the petitioner is found involved in such like offence in future, the concession of bail granted to him today will liable to be withdrawn and the petitioner is bound to face the necessary consequences."

31. This bail is conditional, with the foundational condition being that if the petitioners repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, or commits any offence under the NDPS Act, where the quantity involved is more than half of the intermediate, or commercial, or

CRM-M-51151-2025

violates S. 19, or 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, the State shall file an application to revoke this bail before the Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and as per their discretion, they may cancel this bail.

32. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

33. It is clarified that this bail order shall not be considered as a blanket bail order in any other matter and is only limited to granting bail in the FIR mentioned above.

34. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Appellant-Accused can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

35. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

28.10.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.