



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

226

CRM-M-8778-2026

SHAHRUKH ALI

...PETITIONER

V/s

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

Date of decision: 24.03.2026

Date of uploading: 24.03.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Ms. Savita Rani, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.468 dated 29.07.2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 21 of NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Sector 32-33 Karnal, District Karnal.

2. On 16.02.2026, the following order was passed:-

"The present petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case registered against him vide FIR No.468 dated 29.07.2025 under Section 21 of the NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Sector 32-33, Karnal, Distt. Karnal.

The learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner has been named in the disclosure statement of his co-accused.

Other than that there is no corroborative additional evidence available against him. Reliance is placed on the order in 'Vijay Singh versus The State of Haryana, bearing Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s).1266/2023 decided on 17.05.2023', which is reproduced as under:-

"The petitioner is alleged to have committed offences under Sections 15 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter called the NDPS Act". His application for anticipatory bail was rejected by the High Court. The allegations in the FIR are that 1.7 Kg of Poppy Straw (Doda Post) was recovered from the co-accused. The petitioner concededly was not



present at the spot but was named by the co-accused. That apart there is no other material to implicate the petitioner. The prosecution urges that another case with allegations of commission of offence under the NDPS Act are pending against the petitioner. It is not denied that in those proceedings he was granted bail. Having regard to these circumstances, the petitioner is directed to the enlarged on anticipatory bail, subject to such terms and conditions as the trial Court may impose.

The petition is allowed.

All pending applications are disposed of.”

Notice of motion.

Mr. Viney Phogat, DAG, Haryana, present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of the State.

Adjourned to 24.03.2026.

In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to appear before the SHO/Investigating Officer to join investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of SHO/Investigating Agency, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.:-

(i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation before the investigating officer as and when required;

(ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) that the petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the Court and shall surrender his passport, if any. Meanwhile, the State is directed to file an affidavit/reply as to the exact role of the petitioner and his co-accused alongwith the details of pending FIRs, if any, on or before the next date of hearing.”

3. Reply dated 19.03.2026 by way of an affidavit of Rajiv Kumar, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, City, Karnal has been filed on behalf of respondent-State. The same be taken on record. Learned State counsel (on instructions) has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation and he is not required for further custodial interrogation.

4. 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 16.02.2026, 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**.



5. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the order dated 16.02.2026, granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner is hereby made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.
9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

24.03.2026
jatin

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