

CRM-M-55150-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-55150-2025
Reserved on: 01.10.2025
Pronounced on: 28.10.2025

Sajan ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Rahul Kadian, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdev Singh Thind, DAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
261	16.06.2025	City Faridkot, Distt. Faridkot	21-B of NDPS Act (Section 29 added later on)

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.
2. Per paragraph 8 of the bail petition and reply, the petitioner has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1	234	04.08.2021	307, 326, 325, 324, 148, 149, 120B IPC	City Faridkot
2	340	2022	307, 336, 427, 506, 34 IPC and 25 of Arms Act	City Faridkot
3	294	2021	61 of Excise Act	City Faridkot

3. The facts and allegations are taken from the reply filed by the State. On 16-06-2025, based on a chance recovery, the Police seized 152 grams of heroin from the possession of the main accused Aishpreet Singh. The Investigator claims to have complied with all the statutory requirements under NDPS Act and BNSS 2023.
4. During custodial interrogation, the main accused, Aishpreet Singh confessed before the Police officer that he was handling the heroin at the instance of the petitioner Sajan. Based on such confession before the police, the petitioner was arraigned as an accused. Apprehending arrest, he filed for anticipatory bail from the Sessions Court, which denied him bail. Feeling aggrieved, he has invoked the concurrent jurisdiction of this Court

CRM-M-55150-2025

under S. 482 BNSS, 2023.

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

6. The petitioner’s counsel submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner 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 petitioner shall have no objection.

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

REASONING:

8. As per paragraph 4-B of the reply, the contraband is 152 grams of heroin.

9. Dealing in 152 grams of heroin in contravention of the NDPS Act, 1985, constitutes an offense under the following provisions and notifications:

Substance Name	Heroin/ Chitta/ Smack/ Brown Sugar/ Diacetylmorphine
Quantity detained	152 Gram
Punishable U/s	S.21(b) of NDPS Act, 1985
Quantity type	Intermediate
Drug Quantity in % to upper limit of Intermediate	60.80%

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)

<i>Specified as small & Commercial in S.2(viia) & 2(xxiii) NDPS Act, 1985</i>		
Notification No. & dated	S.O.1055(E)	10/19/2001
-		
Sr. No.	56	

CRM-M-55150-2025

Common Name (Name of Narcotic Drug and Psychotropic Substance (International non-proprietary name (INN)	Heroin
Other non-proprietary name	*****
Chemical Name	Diacetylmorphine
Small Quantity	< 5 Gram
Commercial Quantity	> 250 Gram

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

Sr. No.	2(xvi)(d)
Common Name (Name of Narcotic Drug and Psychotropic Substance (International non-proprietary name (INN)	*****
Other non-proprietary name	*****
Chemical Name	2(xvi)(d) diacetylmorphine, that is, the alkaloid also known as dia-morphine or heroin and its salts; Explanation.-- For the purposes of clauses (v) (vi), (xv) and (xvi) the percentages in the case of liquid preparations shall be calculated on the basis that a preparation containing one per cent. of a substance means a preparation in which one gram of substance, if solid, or one mililitre of substance, if liquid, is contained in every one hundred mililitre of the preparation and so on in proportion for any greater or less percentage: Provided that the Central Government may, having regard to the developments in the field of methods of calculating percentages in liquid preparations prescribed, by rules, any other basis which it may deem appropriate for such calculation.

10. 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.

CRM-M-55150-2025

11. 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.

12. It would be appropriate to refer to the evidence collected against the petition, which is taken from para 4-D of the reply, which reads as follows:

“4D. The Evidence Against Petitioner:

That during interrogation, co-accused Aishpreet Singh disclosed that "he became friend of Sajjan Walia-petitioner who was living at Kharar and he often used to visit the petitioner at Kharar. When he was studying at Ludhiana, the petitioner-Sajjan used to visit him as well. The petitioner disclosed to him that he is selling Heroin and if he will supply his Heroin, he will be given money by petitioner. He came back from Ludhiana to Faridkot and indulge with petitioner-Sajjan in drug trafficking. He earlier supplied the Heroin at the instance of petitioner and he was given Rs. 40000/- by petitioner through UPI on his mobile no. 62840-88326. The petitioner had given him motor cycle Bullet and instructed through whasapp call from his mobile number 94663-45755 to collect Heroin from Rupana and was to hand over near Canals at Faridkot. He was delivered Heroin near Rupana factory but before its delivery, he was apprehended by Police." Acting upon the information, the present petitioner has been arraigned as an accused vide Rapat No. 50 dated 16-06-2025 and enhancement of offence under section 29 NDPS Act also made.

That during investigation the ownership of motor cycle Enfield bearing no. PB-04AD-7708 has been verified from the office of RTA Faridkot and found registered in the name of present petitioner-Sajan Walia, consequent thereto enhancement of offence u/s 25/61/85 of NDPS act made vide Rapat No.26 dated 26.08.2025.”

13. 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

CRM-M-55150-2025

the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ S. 23 of BSA, 2023.

14. 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:

(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.

15. The status report filed by the police reveals that the investigator arraigned the petitioner as an 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 petitioner with the main accused. Thus, there is no justification to deny bail.

16. 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.

17. 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.

18. 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

CRM-M-55150-2025

criminal.¹Personal 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 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

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

20. Given the penal provisions invoked, the legal admissibility of evidence collected against the petitioner, quantity of contraband 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.

21. 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 petitioner makes a case for anticipatory bail.

22. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner 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 fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

23. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner 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)	

24. The bail order is subject to the petitioner’s complying with the following terms.

25. The petitioner is 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 petitioner shall be in deemed custody for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ Section 23 of BSA, 2023. The petitioner shall join the

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

CRM-M-55150-2025

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 petitioner shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

26. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner 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.

27. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, 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 petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days of release 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 petitioner 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.

28. 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 petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days, providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

29. 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

CRM-M-55150-2025

necessary consequences.”

30. This bail is conditional, with the foundational condition being that if the petitioner 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 violates S. 19, or 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, the State shall 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 as per their discretion, they may cancel this bail.

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

32. 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.

33. 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.

34. **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.