

2025:PHHC:156816



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

104

CRM-M No.63299 of 2025
Date of decision: 12.11.2025

Vicky Singh ... Petitioner
Vs.
State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Gautam Kumar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, Addl. AG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking anticipatory bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
137	10.05.2015	Hansi Sadar, District Hisar	15 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short 'NDPS Act') (29 of NDPS Act and 420 of IPC added later on)

2. As per the allegations, on the night of 10.05.2015, on receipt of a secret information to the effect that one Skoda car bearing registration No.DL-2CAB-2530 was parked unattended on the road leading from

2025:PHHC:156816



Village Mehjad to Bhatla, a police party reached at the spot and found that one unknown person had towed away the said car with his Swift car bearing registration No.HR-14H-7243 towards Village Bhatala. The police party proceeded towards Village Bhatala and found the abovementioned car being parked on the road. On checking, 200 kgs. of Doda post were found kept in the vehicle which were taken into possession. During the course of investigation, the accused Parveen Kumar @ Vicky son of Surjeet Singh was joined into investigation of this case and interrogated. He suffered a disclosure statement to the effect that he along with the present petitioner and co-accused Sher Singh @ Shera brought 200 kg. of chura post from one Naresh resident of Rajasthan and was transporting it to Sunam in their Skoda vehicle. When the towing chain of the vehicle snapped near Village Bhatala and some public persons had gathered there, he along with the co-accused had fled. Offences under Section 420 of IPC and Section 27 of NDPS Act were added. The petitioner and the other accused Bhola and Sher Singh could not be arrested. Challan qua the accused Parveen @ Vicky was presented. He faced trial and was acquitted on 31.08.2023.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He has no connection with the alleged vehicle as well as the contraband. He was not present at the spot nor he was identified by any police

2025:PHHC:156816



official. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be given benefit of pre arrest bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Apoorv Garg, Addl. AG, Haryana has advance notice of the petition and is ready to argue the matter. It is submitted by him that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. He could not be apprehended in the past. Now arrest warrant had been issued against him for 09.12.2025. His custodial interrogation is required for conducting proper investigation in the matter. No exceptional and extraordinary circumstance for grant of bail is made out in his favour. It is, thus, urged that he does not deserve to be given benefit of anticipatory bail.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to be involved in the business of sale/purchase of contraband. A part of the contraband which was allegedly recovered from the co-accused, had been purchased by him. The petitioner managed to evade his arrest for a period of more than ten and half years. Now warrants had been issued against him. For conducting thorough and proper investigation in the matter, his custodial interrogation is must. In case, the same is denied to the investigation agency, that shall leave many glaring loopholes and gaps, adversely affecting the investigation. The Court has also to see that an

2025:PHHC:156816



order of anticipatory bail should not operate as an inroad in the normal legal procedure of criminal cases by the trial Court. The powers of anticipatory bail are extraordinary and the same are to be exercised sparingly in exceptional circumstances. In the present case, no such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

12.11.2025	(MANISHA BATRA)
manju	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No