



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

Sr.No.206

**CRM-M-16363-2026
Decided on : 01.05.2026**

Surjit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present : Mr. Vivek K.Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS"), the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.455 dated 26.09.2025, registered under Sections 21-C of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (Section 29 of the NDPS Act and Section 238 of BNS added lateron), at Police Station Civil Lines Sirsa, District Hisar. (Annexure P-1).

2. On 22.04.2026, the following order was passed by this Court: -

"Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.455 dated 26.09.2025, registered un-



der Section 21-C of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (Section 29 of the NDPS Act and Section 238 of BNS, 2023 added lateron), at Police Station Civil Lines, Sirsa, District Hisar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that the petitioner was neither present at the spot nor was named in the FIR and he has no concern with the said incident. It has also been contended that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused only on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused Sukhpal Singh alias Sukhi and Jaspreet Singh alias Toti. Apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the offence in question and it is a trite law that disclosure statement of co-accused during his custodial interrogation is not admissible. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. 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.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has appeared and filed the status report, which is taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature.

Adjourned to 01.05.2026.

In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to join investigation within a week from today and would appear as and when required by the Investigating Officer and cooperate with the Investigating Agency. In the event of arrest, he shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.”



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance with the order dated 22.04.2026 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation. He has further argued that there is no connection between the petitioner and the co-accused and that the petitioner is sought to be implicated only on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused.

4. Learned counsel for the State, on instructions, has submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation in terms of interim order/protection earlier afforded to the petitioner and is no longer required for further custodial interrogation. He has however submitted that since the FIR in question is under the NDPS Act of 1985, the petitioner ought not to be extended the concession of anticipatory bail.

5. On a specific query put by this Court to the learned State counsel as to whether, apart from the disclosure statement, any material has been found during investigation to connect the petitioner with the recovered contraband, to which learned State counsel submitted that no material other than disclosure statement has been found to connect the petitioner with either the offence or the recovered contraband.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the rival parties and perused the available record.

7. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court while dealing with a plea for grant of anticipatory bail in a case under NDPS Act, 1985; in a judgment titled as '*Vijay Singh vs. The State of Haryana, bearing Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No.(s)1266/2023 decided on 17.05.2023*' has held as under:



"The petitioner is alleged to have committed offences under Sections 15 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter called the NDPS Act". His application for anticipatory bail was rejected by the High Court. The allegations in the FIR are that 1.7 Kg of Poppy Straw (Doda Post) was recovered from the co-accused. The petitioner concededly was not present at the spot but was named by the co-accused. That apart there is no other material to implicate the petitioner. The prosecution urges that another case with allegations of commission of offence under the NDPS Act are pending against the petitioner. It is not denied that in those proceedings he was granted bail. Having regard to these circumstances, the petitioner is directed to the enlarged on anticipatory bail, subject to such terms and conditions as the trial Court may impose. The petition is allowed. All pending applications are disposed of."

8. In the present case also, the petitioner is sought to be arrayed solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused. Suffice to say there is no other material available to connect the petitioner with the recovered contraband. The veracity of the disclosure statement made by the co-accused will be subject to comprehensive scrutiny during the course of the trial and the same cannot by itself be a ground to decline the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, especially when he has joined the investigation in terms of interim order/protection granted by this Court.

9. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 22.04.2026 passed by this Court is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.



10. Needless to say anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

01.05.2026
mamta

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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