



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

**CRM-M No.4391 of 2026
Date of decision: 07.04.2026**

ISHWAR SINGH SISODIYA

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. B.S. Beniwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

MANDEEP PANNU, J.

1. This is the first anticipatory bail application filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.58 dated 29.05.2019 under Section 15(b) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Jakhal, District Fatehabad, Haryana.

2. Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that on 29.05.2019, a police party headed by ASI Suresh Kumar, on the basis of suspicion, apprehended co-accused Jasbir @ Jassi and upon search, contraband was recovered from him. During investigation, the said co-accused suffered a disclosure statement and disclosed the involvement of the present petitioner, namely Ishwar Singh, stating that the recovered contraband belonged to him. On the basis of such disclosure statement and



other material collected during investigation, the present petitioner was nominated as an accused in the present case. The petitioner, however, has not been arrested so far.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner and he has been falsely implicated in the present case merely on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused, which is not admissible in evidence. It is further submitted that there is no other incriminating material against the petitioner and, therefore, he deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the present petition on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner is the supplier of the contraband and the vehicle from which the contraband was recovered is also in the name of the petitioner. It is further contended that the petitioner was declared proclaimed offender in this case and is yet to be arrested, and he is deliberately avoiding his arrest. However, it is not disputed that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail. A significant factor which weighs with this Court is that the petitioner was declared a proclaimed offender vide order dated 10.05.2022 and since then, he has not chosen to surrender before the Court. His conduct clearly reflects that he has been evading the process of law and has not shown any inclination to submit



himself to the jurisdiction of the Court.

6. The extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail is meant for a person who approaches the Court with clean hands and is willing to cooperate with the investigation. However, in the present case, the petitioner has remained absconding for a considerable period and has not bothered to appear before the Court even after being declared a proclaimed offender. Such conduct disentitles him from seeking the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.

7. In view of the afore-said facts and circumstances, particularly the conduct of the petitioner in evading arrest and remaining a proclaimed offender since 10.05.2022, this Court does not find any ground to grant anticipatory bail.

8. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

9. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

07.04.2026
neetu

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