



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

(110)

CRM-M-15648-2026

DATE OF DECISION: 25.03.2026

Satnam Singh

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr. K.S.Sidhu, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. Second petition under Section 482 of BNSS 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner has been filed in case FIR No.27 dated 07.03.2025 under sections 22 of Narcotic Drugs Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter called as NDPS Act) and Section 15 of Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 [Section 223 of Bharatiya Nyay Sanhita 2023 [Erstwhile Section 188 of IPC and section 27-B/29 of NDPS Act, were added later on], registered at Police Station City Jalalabad, District Fazilka.
2. Brief facts of the case are that the FIR was registered on 07.03.2025 on the basis of secret information regarding illegal sale of intoxicants and psychotropic substances by co-accused Charanpreet Singh and Jatinder Singh at Chan Medical. Upon raid, the co-accused were apprehended and a huge recovery comprising 11,000 tablets of Tramadol Hydrochloride, 7,150 tablets of Alprazolam and 5,68,200 tablets of Pregabalin was effected from them. The petitioner, Satnam Singh, was not named in the FIR and was subsequently implicated on 10.03.2025 solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Charanpreet Singh, alleging that the co-accused had purchased narcotic tablets from him and an



CRM-M-15648-2026

amount of Rs.1,07,000/- was due from the co-accused towards such transactions.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case; that he was not named in the FIR and has been subsequently nominated only on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused, which is inadmissible in evidence; that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner and the entire alleged recovery of 11,000 tablets of Tramadol Hydrochloride, 7,150 tablets of Alprazolam and 5,68,200 tablets of Pregabalin has been made from the co-accused; that the petitioner was neither present at the spot nor had any conscious possession of the alleged contraband; that no independent evidence is available on record to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence. Hence, prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. In support of his contentions, qua maintainability of second bail application, learned counsel has placed reliance upon law laid down by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **Bhisham Singh versus State of Haryana, 2024(3) RCR (Criminal) 65.** Learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for concession of anticipatory bail on the aforesaid ground *inter alia* on the ground that one of the co-accused has already been granted anticipatory bail by virtue of order dated 20.03.2026, passed by another Co-ordinate Bench of this Court CRM-M-62171-2025, titled **Shivam @ Shivam Kumar versus State of Punjab.**

4. Notice of motion.

5. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Anup Singh, learned AAG, Punjab, appeared on behalf of the respondent–State and opposed the bail



CRM-M-15648-2026

petition by submitting that earlier petition seeking anticipatory bail filed by the petitioner had already been dismissed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 27.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-29517-2025; that the said order was assailed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court by way of SLP (Criminal) No. 18373 of 2025, which was also dismissed. It is, thus, contended that in the absence of any change in circumstances, the present second petition is not maintainable and is liable to be dismissed.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds merit in the objection raised by the learned State counsel. Admittedly, the earlier petition for grant of anticipatory bail filed by the petitioner has already been dismissed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court and the said order has attained finality upon dismissal of the SLP by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. No material change in circumstances has been pointed out so as to justify the filing of the present second petition. In such circumstances, entertaining the present petition would amount to re-agitating the same issue again and again, which is impermissible in law. **Bhisham Singh's case (supra)** is not applicable to the factual matrix of the present case as in said case earlier bail petition was dismissed as withdrawn but in the present case earlier bail petition has been dismissed on merits.

8. Accordingly, finding no merit in the present petition, same is hereby dismissed.

25.03.2026

mamta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No