



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh**

111

CRM-M-10508-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 11.03.2026

Deepak Kumar		... Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Punjab		... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- None for the petitioner.
Mr. Adesh Pal Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.55 dated 18.04.2025, registered under Section 21 of NDPS Act, 1985 (Section 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 added later on), at Police Station Bhargo Camp, District Jalandhar.
2. As per the prosecution version, on 18.04.2025 co-accused Karan was apprehended on the basis of suspicion as he got perplexed on seeing the police party and threw one polythene envelop in the vacant plot. On checking of the said polythene envelop, 6.06 grams of heroin was recovered and on the basis of which, present FIR has been registered. Present petitioner was nominated on disclosure statement of said co-accused Karan.
3. A perusal of last zimni order shows that on 26.02.2026, the case was adjourned in the interest of justice as no one has appeared on behalf of the petitioner. Today also, there is no representation on his behalf.



CRM-M-10508-2026 (O&M)

(2)

4. Learned State counsel contended that the contraband was recovered from the co-accused, who nominated the present petitioner as the supplier of the said contraband. It is further contended that the petitioner is having criminal antecedents and is involved in two other cases. Learned State counsel also contended that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation to ascertain the source of the contraband and for recovery of the drug money. Bail application of the petitioner was dismissed by learned Judge, Special Court, Jalandhar by recording specific observation that petitioner was actively involved in conspiracy of drug peddling, and was a member of the drug syndicate run by present petitioner and co-accused Karan. Accordingly, learned State counsel prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the submissions made by learned State counsel that the contraband was recovered from the co-accused, who nominated the present petitioner as the supplier of the said contraband, and further considering that the petitioner is having criminal antecedents and is involved in two other cases, this Court is not inclined to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to know the source of contraband and to unearth the intricate details as to the drug syndicate run by petitioner and co-accused Karan.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has emphasised the importance of custodial interrogation in case titled as '**CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR**



CRM-M-10508-2026 (O&M) (3)

Supreme Court 3806’ decided on 03.08.1997, by holding that many useful informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

8. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands **dismissed**.

9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

11.03.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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