

2026:PHHC:048282



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

104

**CRM-M-16858-2026
Date of Decision: 27.03.2026**

PARASPREET SINGH @ PARAS

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Mr. Jasvir Singh Dhaliwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail for the petitioner in FIR No.33 dated 07.02.2026 under Sections 21(C) and 29/61/85 of the NDPS Act, 1985 and Sections 25, 26 and 29 of the Bharatiya Vayuyan Adhiniyam, 2024 registered at Police Station Khalra, District Tarn Taran.

The case of the prosecution is that from the co-accused persons namely Gurwinder Singh and Navjot Singh, 2 kgs and 489 grams of heroin was recovered. Later on, they suffered disclosure statements to the effect that the present petitioner was also involved with them in the business of narcotics, on the basis of which, the petitioner was also nominated as an accused in the present case.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at this stage, apart from the said disclosure statement(s) of the co-accused persons, there is no other evidence or incriminating material to implicate the petitioner in the present case or to connect him with the recovery of said contraband. He further submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called for.

Notice of motion.

Mr. P.S. Pandher, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and vehemently opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in other criminal cases as well.

I have heard the learned counsel for the respective parties and have gone through the documents and other material available on record.

The counsel for the petitioner is not in a position to deny that the fact that the petitioner is involved in other criminal case under Arms Act and as such, it can be said that the petitioner is a habitual offender and his antecedents are not clean. In order to make thorough investigation, his custodial interrogation would be necessary. Hence, no ground is made out to grant the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage.

Dismissed.

MARCH 27, 2026.

Rajender

**(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No