



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-15177-2026

Date of decision: 16.04.2026

NARINDERPAL SINGH**....Petitioner****Versus**

**INTELLIGENCE OFFICER, DIRECTORATE OF REVENUE
INTELLIGENCE LUDHIANA**

....Respondent**CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL**

Present:- Mr. SPS Sidhu, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Ankit Bhinder, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sourabh Goel, Special Public Prosecutor
for the respondent.

.....

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case vide File No.DRI/Ldh/855/INT-05/2025 dated 16.11.2025 registered under Sections 17, 18, 19 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, at Police Station DRI Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

2. Brief facts of the present case as per the prosecution are that acting upon a secret information, the officers of DRI, Ludhiana on 15.11.2025 seized 735 grams of opium contained in 04 parcels in DHL Office, Dhandhari Kalan, Ludhiana which was destined through courier from India to USA.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that neither the petitioner was named in the FIR nor has any concern with the



said offence. He further contends that the courier containing opium recovered by DRI was booked by one Mehar Singh. He further submits that the vehicle in question as is seen in the CCTV footage is not registered in the name of the petitioner. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. He further submits that the recovered contraband is non-commercial in nature. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by learned Judge, Special Court, Ludhiana, vide order dated 05.03.2026.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Directorate of Revenue Intelligence has already filed the status report and while relying upon the same, has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, by submitting that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He argued that during investigation in the present case it was found that the vehicle used for booking the courier was used by the present petitioner. He further submitted that the wife of the petitioner had identified him in the CCTV footage when he had gone to book the courier containing opium. He further submits that the learned Trial Court has already issued warrants of arrest against the petitioner vide orders dated 22.01.2026 and since then he has been evading his arrest. He further argued that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to



enquire about his role in the drug nexus. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Heard.

7. In the present case, the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. As per the prosecution, the vehicle used for booking the courier parcel containing opium was being used by the present petitioner. Furthermore, the petitioner has been identified in the said CCTV footage by his wife, which lends prima facie credence to the prosecution case. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for fair and effective investigation in the matter.

8. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**State Vs. Anil Sharma', (1997) 7 SCC 187**, wherein it has been held as under:

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person



knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

9. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation and if it is denied, it will leave many loose ends, which is not desired. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is hereby dismissed.

10. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

16.04.2026
puneet

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |