



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

**CRM-M No.61977 of 2025
Date of Decision: 06.11.2025**

Gurnam Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. B.S. Bhalla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Arora, D.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.46, dated 11.02.2025, under Sections 21(c), 25, 29 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Anti-Narcotics Force (ANTF).

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the police in collaboration with the BSF (Border Security Force) personnel conducted a joint operation in the area of village Talwandi. On 11.02.2025, at about 5:30 pm, a secret information was received to the effect that Surjit Singh @ Surjit, Labha Singh @ Labha and Sukh, were involved in smuggling of Heroin. It was informed that they would come on their Splendor motorcycle bearing No.PB14-D-0784 near the Langar Hall of village Chhota Fattowal to supply heroin to their customer and if the barricading is laid they could be arrested along with the contraband. On receiving the secret information, raiding team was constituted and barricading was laid



at the place disclosed. At about 6:15 pm, three young men as disclosed in the secret information were seen coming on the motorcycle. On seeing the Police, one of the man escaped alongwith the motorcycle whereas two of them were apprehended. On asking, they disclosed their names to be Surjit Singh @ Surjit and Labha Singh @ Labha. They disclosed the name of the third person, who escaped, to be Sukh. They were suspected to be carrying some contraband and thus, their search was conducted. On conducting search of Surjit Singh, 550 grams of heroin was recovered from the right pocket of his jacket. Thereafter, search of Labha Singh was conducted and another 550 grams of heroin was recovered from the right pocket of his jacket, thus, a total 1 kg 100 grams of heroin was recovered from both of them. They failed to produce any licence regarding possession of the same and thus, the FIR was registered and investigation commenced. During investigation, their disclosure statement was recorded wherein complicity of the petitioner surfaced, who was alleged to be the supplier of the contraband recovered from them. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner approached the Court of learned Judge, Special Court, Amritsar praying for the grant of anticipatory bail. However, after hearing both the sides, finding no merit in the same, the learned Judge, Special Court, Amritsar, dismissed the same vide order dated 15.10.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of anticipatory bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case.



He submits that neither the petitioner is named in the FIR nor any recovery has been effected from him. He submits that the disclosure statement of the co-accused is not even an admissible evidence, thus, there being no *prima facie* having been made out against the present petitioner, he deserves to be granted anticipatory bail.

4. Learned State counsel had opposed the submission made by counsel for the petitioner and has submitted that the recovered contraband from the co-accused is a commercial quantity. He submits that the petitioner is found to be the supplier of the contraband. He submits that the investigation is at initial stage, thus, no case for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out and the present petition being devoid of merit deserves to be dismissed.

5. On hearing of the counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that a total recovery of 1 kg 100 grams of heroin was effected from the co-accused, who were named in the secret information. During investigation, the disclosure statement of co-accused Surjit Singh was recorded wherein, he disclosed that recovered contraband was supplied by Manjot Singh @ Granthi, one Sukha Singh and the petitioner. It was found that the petitioner was smuggling heroin in connivance with the co-accused. The petitioner agreed to send the contraband for an amount of Rs.11 lacs. Co-accused, namely, Sukha has also approached this Court praying for grant of bail, however, the same has been declined by this Court. Needless to say that the investigation is at initial stage.



6. For the consideration of anticipatory bail, the statutory parameters are given under Section 482 (1) & (2) BNSS which reads as under:-

“Direction for grant of bail to person apprehending arrest:

1. *When any person has reason to believe that he may be arrested on an accusation of having committed a non-bailable offence, he may apply to the High Court or the Court of Session for a direction under this section; and that Court may, if it thinks fit, direct that in the event of such arrest, he shall be released on bail.*
2. *When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-*
 - (i) *a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
 - (ii) *a condition that the person 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 from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
 - (iii) *a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous 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.”*

7. As per the law settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in ***Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab***, AIR 1980 SC 1632, while granting anticipatory bail, the Court is to maintain a balance between the individual liberty and the interest of society. However, the interest of the society would always prevail upon the right of personal liberty. The relevant part of the judgment is as follows:-



“31. In regard to anticipatory bail, if the proposed accusation appears to stem not from motives of furthering the ends of justice but from some ulterior motive, the object being to injure and humiliate the applicant by having him arrested, a direction for the release of the applicant on bail in the event of his arrest would generally be made. On the other hand, if it appears likely, considering the antecedents of the applicant, that taking advantage of the order of anticipatory bail he will flee from justice, such an order would not be made. But the converse of these propositions is not necessarily true. That is to say, it cannot be laid down as an inexorable rule that anticipatory bail cannot be granted unless the proposed accusation appears to be actuated by mala fides; and, equally, that anticipatory bail must be granted if there is no fear that the applicant will abscond. There are several other considerations, too numerous to enumerate, the combined effect of which must weigh with the court while granting or rejecting anticipatory bail. The nature and seriousness of the proposed charges, the context of the events likely to lead to the making of the charges, a reasonable possibility of the applicant's presence not being secured at the trial, a reasonable apprehension that witnesses will be tampered with and "the larger interests of the public or the state" are some of the considerations which the court has to keep in mind while deciding an application for anticipatory bail. The relevance of these considerations was pointed out in *State v. Captain Jagjit Singh* (1962) 3 SCR 622, which, though, was a case under the old Section 498 which corresponds to the present Section 439 of the Code. It is of paramount consideration to remember that the freedom of the individual is as necessary for the



survival of the society as it is for the egoistic purposes of the individual. A person seeking anticipatory bail is still a free man entitled to the presumption of innocence. He is willing to submit to restraints on his freedom, by the acceptance of conditions which the court may think fit to impose, in consideration of the assurance that if arrested, he shall be enlarged on bail.”

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State Vs. Anil Sharma***, (1997) 7SCC 187, held as under:-

“6. *We find force in the submission of the CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favorable 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 informations 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.”*



9. The petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of anticipatory bail, however, Hon'ble Supreme Court in *The State of Haryana vs. Samarth Kumar, 2022 Livelaw (SC) 622* has held that in the cases like the present one, the accused may take advantage of facts like no recovery was effected from him and that he was implicated on the basis of disclosure statement made by the main accused, at the time of arguing regular bail application or at the time of final hearing after conclusion of trial.

10. Weighing the facts of the case on the anvil of the law settled, it is apparent that the complicity of the petitioner has been prima facie found. Allegations made against the petitioner are serious in nature. Needless to say, the investigation is at the initial stage and in the facts and circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be essential and granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage would scuttle the ongoing investigation.

11. In view of the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner does not qualify for the grant of anticipatory bail and the same is hereby dismissed. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

06.11.2025

ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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