



CRM-M-57744 of 2025

-1-

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

206

CRM-M-57744 of 2025
Date of Decision: 31.10.2025

Raval Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Ms. Sukhpreet Kaur Grewal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravinder Singh, DAG, Punjab.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.191 dated 07.12.2024 registered under Section 21-C of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (Section 25 of the NDPS Act added later on), at Police Station Special Task Force, District SAS Nagar (Mohali).

2. Brief facts of the present case are that as per the prosecution, on 07.12.2024, ASI Amandeep Singh, along with his fellow police officials was on patrolling duty and on the basis of secret information, apprehended one person, namely, Jashanpreet Singh, who was found in conscious possession of 3 kg. 27 grams of heroin. Initially, the FIR in question was registered against the said co-accused Jashanpreet Singh.

**CRM-M-57744 of 2025****-2-**

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that neither the petitioner was named in the FIR nor has any concern with the said offence. It has also been contended that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused only on the basis of the disclosure statement made by co-accused Jashanpreet Singh. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way qua the petitioner. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Judge, Special Court, Amritsar, vide order dated 04.09.2025.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report in the matter, which is taken on record and while referring to the same, has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, by submitting that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He argued that recovery of alleged contraband in the present case was effected from co-accused Jashanpreet Singh, which falls under the commercial quantity and as per his disclosure statement, he got the said contraband from the present petitioner, one Gursewak Singh @ Bumb and Ravi Singh which shows the direct involvement of the petitioner in supply of drugs. He further argued that the car from which the alleged contraband was recovered, is



CRM-M-57744 of 2025

-3-

registered in the name of the present petitioner. He further argued that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to ascertain the backward and forward linkages in the business of selling and trading of narcotic drugs. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Heard.

7. In the present case, the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. As per the prosecution, the contraband i.e. heroin which was recovered from co-accused Jashanpreet Singh was handed to him by the present petitioner and the car which was used in the supply of drugs was also registered in the name of the petitioner. The investigation *prima facie* indicates involvement of the petitioner in the drug nexus.

8. There is steady increase of smuggling of illicit drugs in the country. The increasing instances of drug smuggling pose a grave threat not only to the general public but also impacts the youth of the nation. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for fair and effective investigation in the matter.

9. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '***State Vs. Anil Sharma***', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial



CRM-M-57744 of 2025

-4-

interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

10. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation and if it is denied, it will leave many loose ends, which is not desired. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is hereby dismissed.

11. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

31.10.2025
D.Bansal

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