



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(218)

CRM-M-15068-2026(O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 12.05.2026

Beeru Kumar

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Vikas Kumar Dhariwal, Advocate, (through VC)
for the petitioner.
Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. AG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. This is the first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short - 'the BNSS') seeking **anticipatory bail** in a case bearing FIR No.0052 dated 02.03.2026 (Annexure P-1), under Section 20(b)(ii)(B) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, (for short – 'the NDPS Act'), registered at Police Station Sector 14, Gurugram, Haryana.
2. Allegations against the present petitioner are that he supplied contraband (sulpha) to co-accused Surender Singh by luring him with prospects of earning profits from sale of *charas* (sulpha). Pursuant thereto, petitioner supplied approximately 572 gms of said contraband to co-accused for consideration of Rs.18,000/- playing a pivotal role in procuring and channelizing narcotic substance for further distribution.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the following grounds:-



- i. That the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case;
- ii. That the petitioner was neither present at the spot nor named in the FIR and he has no concern with the alleged occurrence;
- iii. That the petitioner has been nominated as an accused solely on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused;
- iv. That except for the aforesaid disclosure statement, there is no independent evidence available on record to connect him with the alleged offence;
- v. That the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency.

4. On the other hand, Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. AG, Haryana, appears on behalf of State and submits that the reply has already been filed and the same is taken on record. Leaned State counsel opposes the bail petition on the following grounds:

- i That the petitioner has played an active role in the commission of offence;
- ii. That he was the supplier and facilitator of the contraband recovered, which directly establishes his involvement in the commission of offence;
- iii That apart from the disclosure statement of co-accused Surender, there is electronic evidence against the petitioner which substantiates his nexus with the commission of crime; that the call detail records (Annexure R-2) of cell No. 8700379771 had been obtained, which is linked with the bank account of the petitioner maintained with the Bank of India, Old Railway Road, Gurugaon. The analysis of the same



revealed that the petitioner had been in conversation with co-accused Surender which prima facie points towards the petitioner's participation in commission of offence;

iv. That the petitioner is a habitual criminal and apart from the present case, he is involved in four more cases out of which two are under the NDPS Act and two are under IPC.

Hence, prayer for dismissal of the present petition is made.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and contentions of learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the view that the petitioner is not entitled for grant of discretionary relief of anticipatory bail on the following grounds:

i That petitioner has been attributed the role of a supplier and facilitator in respect of the contraband recovered connecting him with alleged procurement and supply chain of narcotic substance;

ii That there is electronic evidence against the petitioner which prima facie establishes his nexus with commission of alleged crime. Call detail records obtained during investigation reflects that mobile number in question is linked with bank account of the petitioner and the petitioner was in contact with co-accused much prior to the arrest of co-accused,

iii. That the petitioner is not having clean antecedents and apart from the present case as he is involved in four more cases and

iv. That custodial interrogation of petitioner is required for proper investigation.



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 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.
11. All pending misc. applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

12.05.2026
mamta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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