



CRM-M-6482-2026

-1-

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

265

CRM-M-6482-2026

Date of decision :29.04.2026

Prathvi Singh Shekhawat

..... Petitioner

V/S

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present: Mr. D.N.Ganeriwala, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Ayuwan Singh, AAG, Haryana.

AMARJOT BHATTI J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner – Prathvi Singh Shekhawat has filed this petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.419 dated 22.11.2025, registered under Section 17C, 25, 29 and 8 of NDPS Act, 1985, at Police Station Sadar, District Sirsa.
2. As per facts of the case, on 22.11.2025, Sub Inspector Naresh Kumar, along with the police party was going in connection with crime prevention and drug prevention. He was present at village Mateka, near the main road, when he received information from a reliable source that Sushil Kumar, son of late Devi Lal was selling opium in large quantity and on that day, he was to leave his house with a huge quantity of opium and in case the raid was conducted, a huge quantity of contraband could be recovered. On the basis of this information, a raid was conducted as per the rules and from the possession of Sushil Kumar 02 Kg. 746 grams of opium was recovered along with waxed packing.



During the course of investigation, the name of present petitioner cropped up in the disclosure statement of Sushil Kumar.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that he is being falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement. He had no connection with the said recovery. He was granted interim relief by the Coordinate Bench vide order dated 20.02.2026 and accordingly, he has already joined the investigation. He is still ready to cooperate with the investigating agency. Therefore, the interim bail already granted in his favour may be confirmed.

4. Learned counsel representing State opposed the present petition. It is pointed out that from the possession of co-accused Sushil Kumar, 02 Kg. 746 grams of opium was recovered. During the course of investigation, the disclosure statement of Sushil Kumar was recorded, who named present petitioner Prathvi Singh Shekhawat, from whom he used to purchase huge quantity of opium for sale. During investigation, call record of both the accused was obtained, which clearly showed that they were regularly in touch with each other. It is conceded that petitioner joined investigation on 25.02.2026 and 27.02.2026, but did not cooperate with the investigating agency. He did not hand over his mobile phone. For completing the investigation, his custodial interrogation is required.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. In the case in hand, 02 Kg. 746 grams of opium was recovered from Sushil Kumar, and the name of present petitioner figured in the disclosure statement. In the said disclosure statement, it is stated that Sushil Kumar was purchasing contraband from present petitioner and was selling the same. The investigating

**CRM-M-6482-2026****-3-**

agency checked the call detail record of present petitioner and co-accused Sushil Kumar, which indicated that they were in constant touch with each other. In pursuance of interim relief granted by the Coordinate Bench, petitioner joined investigation twice, but as per learned State counsel, he did not cooperate with the investigating agency, nor he handed over his mobile phone. Apart from the aforesaid factual position, as per the status report, petitioner does not have clean antecedents. He is involved in 03 other FIRs, as detailed in para No.16 of the status report dated 13.02.2026. In FIR No.424 dated 02.09.2003, under Section 17/18/61/85 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Rania, District Sirsa, he was acquitted, whereas the other two FIRs, i.e. FIR No.365 of 2006, under Section 8 of NDPS Act and Section 279/337 of IPC, registered at Police Station Nohar, District Hanumangarh and another FIR No.120 dated 24.08.2015 under Section 17/18/29/61/85 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Odhan is fixed for defence evidence. Therefore, present petitioner was involved in other FIRs registered under NDPS Act prior to the registration of present FIR.

Considering the aforesaid factual position, matter requires thorough investigation. Therefore, I do not find a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail and the same is accordingly declined.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

29.04.2026.*Sunil Devi*

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