



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

201

**CRM-M No.4409 of 2026
Date of decision : 15.5.2026
Date of uploading : 15.5.2026**

Malkeet Singh @ HannyPetitioner
Versus
State of HaryanaRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Bhavneet Singh, Advocate, for
Mr. Kamal Jindal, Advocate, for the petitioner

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, Senior DAG, Haryana

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 17.2.2026, the following order was passed:

'Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.189, dated 16.12.2025, under Sections 21b, 61, 85 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Odhan, District Dabwali.

Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. 7 grams and 220 miligrams of heroin was recovered from the co-accused, namely, Inklab Singh @ Gagan, which is 2 grams more than the small quantity. The petitioner has been named in the FIR on the basis of the statement of co-accused, who has already been granted the concession of regular bail by the learned Trial Court, vide order dated 27.01.2026. Petitioner is not involved in any other case and is ready to join the investigation.

Learned State counsel has opposed the bail of the petitioner by contending that the petitioner was specifically named in the instant FIR as well as in the disclosure statement of co-accused, namely, Inklab Singh @ Gagan.



Petitioner was the supplier of recovered contraband. However, learned State counsel has not disputed the fact that the co-accused has been granted the concession of regular bail by the learned Trial Court.

Adjourned to 15.05.2026.

In the meanwhile, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed and he shall join the investigation and co-operate with the investigating agency and shall not leave country without prior permission of this Court.'

2. Learned State counsel (on instructions) submits that pursuant to the order dated 17.2.2026, the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

3. In view of the stance of the State, especially the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and he being arrayed as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement, this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated 17.2.2026, in light of the dicta of the judgment passed by this Court in ***CRM-M-54032-2024 'Ashu Vs. State of Punjab'*** and recent judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in ***'Jugraj Singh Vs. State of Punjab'*** bearing ***Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No.9190/2025***.

4. In view of the above, the instant petition is allowed. The interim order dated 17.2.2026, passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

5. This order should not be treated as "blanket" order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

6. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any



condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

7. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

15.5.2026
Ashwani

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