



CRM-M-14194-2026

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(109)

CRM-M-14194-2026
DATE OF DECISION: 16.03.2026

Dharampal

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Kartar Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr.DAG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.79 dated 22.02.2026 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 21(b) of NDPS Act (Section 27-A of NDPS Act added lateron), registered at Police Station City Fatehabad, District Fatehabad.

2. Brief facts of the case are that on the basis of secret information, police apprehended co-accused Sumit and recovery of 06 grams and 49 milligrams Heroin was effected, who in his disclosure statement disclosed that he purchased the recovered contraband from present petitioner Dharampal.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner is involved in this case only on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused which is inadmissible in the evidence; the contraband recovered i.e 06 gm 49 milligrams Heroin is marginally higher than the small quantity and that the petitioner is ready to join the investigation. Hence, prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made.



CRM-M-14194-2026

2

4. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr.DAG, Haryana, appeared and opposed the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner was nominated by the co-accused from whose possession, the contraband was recovered; petitioner sold the recovered contraband to co-accused for a sum of Rs.11,200/-; that he is also involved in drug trafficking and one more FIR was registered against him 5/6 months prior to the present FIR and the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation to know the source of contraband and recovery of the drug money.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case that petitioner is nominated by co-accused, from whose possession, contraband has been recovered being the supplier of the recovered contraband; that the present petitioner is also involved in another case of NDPS Act and he is required for custodial interrogation to know the source of the recovered contraband as well as to effect recovery of drug money, anticipatory bail cannot be granted to the petitioner.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has emphasised the importance of custodial interrogation *in case titled as 'CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR 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. Honble Apex Court in *Anarul S.K. Vs. The State of West Bengal (SLP (Crl.) No.12621-2024* has observed that the grant of



CRM-M-14194-2026 3

anticipatory bail in cases involving Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (NDPS) is a very serious issue.

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

10. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

16.03.2026	(SUBHAS MEHLA)
mamta	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No