

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:057144



(202)

CRM-M-9023-2026
Decided on: 16.4.2026
Uploaded on: 16.4.2026

Karamjeet Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Kuldeep Bishnoi, Advocate for
Mr. S.K. Bishnoi, Advocate for the petitioner (s).

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Sumeet Goel (Oral):

1. 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.011 dated 05.01.2026 under Sections 21(b), 61/85 of the NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Ellenabad, District Sirsa, Haryana.
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.011 dated 05.01.2026 under Sections 121(b), 61/85 of the NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Ellenabad, District Sirsa, Haryana.

The learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner has been named in the disclosure statement of his coaccused. 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 25.03.2026.

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 coaccused alongwith the details of pending FIRs, if any, on or before the next date of hearing.”

3. Learned State counsel (on instructions from SI Satyawar) has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation.

4. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand, especially the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation, 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.

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.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

16.4.2026

Naveen

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

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