



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

104

CRM-M No.13025 of 2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision :28.04.2026

Harpreet Lal @ Happy

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Sumit Dua, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, DAG, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

1. This petition for anticipatory bail is the second petition, filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.222 dated 12.12.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 21(b) [Section 29 added later on] of Narcotic Drugs & Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, Police Station Navi Baradari, District Jalandhar.

2. Vide order dated 10.03.2026, the petitioner was admitted to interim anticipatory bail, subject to the condition of furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. It was also directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation.

3. The learned State Counsel has filed short reply. The same be taken on record.

4. Heard.



5. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that in compliance with order dated 10.03.2026, the petitioner has already joined the investigation, and that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner. In view of above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has requested that the order dated 10.03.2026 be made absolute.

6. The learned State counsel has controverted the above mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel, although the petitioner has joined investigation, but custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to find out the source of supply as there are allegations against the petitioner that he is the main supplier.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. With regard to fact-situation of this case and the above mentioned arguments, following are the relevant factors which are supposed to be taken into consideration:-

- i) that the petitioner has already joined the investigation;
- ii) that the petitioner cannot be forced to assist the prosecuting agency for the recovery of incriminating material, which may harm his interest or may amount to defeating his right of defence, as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of "Vijay Kumar Gupta Vs., State of Madhya Pradesh" [Criminal Appeal No.939 of 2026, Decided on 16.02.2026];

9. Keeping in view the aforesaid submissions and the fact that the petitioner has already joined the investigation, it is hereby ordered that the petitioner is entitled for anticipatory bail. Hence, the present petition is hereby



allowed and the order dated 10.03.2026, whereby the petitioner was accorded the benefit of interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

28.04.2026
Manoj Bhutani

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