



CRM-M-59488-2025 (O&amp;M) -1-

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

104

**CRM-M-59488-2025  
Decided on: 18.11.2025**

**PARAMJEET SINGH**

.....Petitioner

**Versus**

**STATE OF PUNJAB**

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present: Mr. Kuldip Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)**

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.232 dated 26.07.2025, registered under Section 21 of NDPS Act, 1985 Act (Section 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 Act added later on), registered at Police Station Guruharsahai, District Ferozepur.

2. Brief facts of the case are that on 26.07.2025, on the basis of secret information, co-accused namely, Rinku, Jaswinder Singh and Amarjeet Singh were apprehended and 620 grams of *Heroin* was recovered from their conscious possession. Further, during interrogation, co-accused Rinku, Jaswinder Singh and Amarjeet Singh suffered disclosure statements that the recovered *Heroin* was bought by them from the present petitioner-Paramjit Singh.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the present petitioner was not named in the present FIR and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contended that the petitioner has been involved in the present case only on the basis of disclosure statement. It is also contended that the petitioner is a poor labourer and there is a dispute between the co-accused and the present petitioner regarding his wages, so his name has figured in the said disclosure statement and as such, he prayed for the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. On advance notice, learned counsel for the State has put in appearance and opposed the grant of bail on the ground that the present petitioner has criminal antecedents and is already involved in one case under NDPS Act, another case under the Excise Act & one more under the IPC. He also contended that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation to know the source of contraband and also to recover drug money. Moreover, the contraband recovered from the co-accused falls under the category of commercial quantity.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the fact that allegations against the petitioner are that he is supplier of the contraband and the alleged contraband falling under the category of commercial quantity, has been recovered from the co-accused, who has named the present petitioner in his disclosure statement; custodial interrogation is required to know the source of alleged contraband to collect evidence for the success of prosecution

case.



CRM-M-59488-2025 (O&amp;M) -3-

7. Honble Apex Court in **Anarul S.K. Vs. The State of West Bengal (SLP (Crl.) No.12621-2024)** has observed that the grant of anticipatory bail in cases involving Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (NDPS) is a very serious issue.

8. Also, Hon'ble the Supreme Court in case titled as **"State by the Inspector of Police Vs. B. Ramu"**, 2024 SCC Online SC 4073 has observed as under:

*"In case of recovery of such a huge quantity of narcotic substance, the Courts should be slow in granting even regular bail to the accused what to talk of anticipatory bail more so when the accused is alleged to be having criminal antecedents"*

9. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.

10. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

**(SUBHAS MEHLA)**  
**JUDGE**

**18.11.2025**  
*Sonia Puri*

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO  
Whether Reportable: YES/NO