



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

219

CRM-M-59909-2025
Date of decision: 15.12.2025

HARJIT SINGH ALIAS BABBU

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. H.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab
assisted by ASI Dilbagh Singh.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR. J.(Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.182 dated 07.08.2025 registered at Police Station Sadar Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran under Section 21(b) and 29 of NDPS Act.

2. On 28.10.2025, following order was passed:-

“Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.182 dated 07.08.2025 registered at Police Station Sadar Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran under Section 21(b) and 29 of NDPS Act.

Notice of motion. Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab, has appeared and accepted notice on behalf of the State. Both the parties have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused.

Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 07.08.2025, police party headed by SI Dilbagh Singh was on patrolling duty in connection with detection of crime. When the police party was at Jeobala Drain bridge, two persons were seen coming on foot & on seeing the police



- 2 -

vehicle, one of them quickly pulled out a polythene packet from the left pocket of his jeans and threw it on the roadside, after which both tried to turn back. However, when SI Dilbagh Singh asked them to stop, both of them tried to run away. One person was apprehended by the police party and on inquiry, he disclosed his name as Kuldeep Singh @ Peepa while one person ran away. On search of the polythene bag, 10 grams of heroin was recovered. During interrogation, co-accused Kuldeep Singh @ Peepa disclosed the name of the petitioner, Harjit Singh @ Babbu, as the other person who was with him. Apprehending arrest, the petitioner applied for anticipatory bail, which has been dismissed by the trial Court vide order dated 16.10.2025 (Annexure P-2).

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The disclosure statement of co-accused Kuldeep Singh @ Peepa, 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 he will 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**” and order dated 20.08.2025 passed by Hon’ble Supreme Court in Criminal Appeal No.3640/2025 @ SLP (Crl) No.9190/2025 titled as ‘**Jugraj Singh Vs. State of Punjab**’. Learned counsel also placed on file the order dated 03.04.2025 passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-18403-2025 in the aforesaid case vide which bail application of aforesaid Jugraj Singh was rejected.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer and argued that the name of the petitioner has emerged during investigation and co-accused Kuldeep Singh @ Peepa has disclosed that he had absconded from the spot and as such, his custodial interrogation is essential to trace the source from where the contraband was arranged and petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail.

Adjourned to **15.12.2025** for filing status report.



In the 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, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2)

Cr.P.C.]:-

i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court;

iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of Section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.”

3. Today learned State counsel has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 28.10.2025 and is no longer required for further investigation.

4. In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 28.10.2025, whereby the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute. However, he shall continue to join investigation, if and so required by the Investigating Officer.

5. Disposed of.

6. Pending misc application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

15.12.2025
amandeep

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No