



CRM-M-17189-2026

-1-

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

105

CRM-M-17189-2026

Date of decision : 30.03.2026

GURNAM SINGH

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.. RESPONDENTS

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

Present:- Mr. Kulwinder Singh, Advocate and
Ms. Srishti Shukla, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 (erstwhile Section 438 Cr.P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.57 dated 11.03.2026, registered under Section 15 of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Makhu, District Ferozepur.
2. The case of the prosecution is that on the basis of a secret information, a raid was conducted and 5 kg. of poppy husk plants were allegedly recovered from the fields belonging to the petitioner.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner, who is 64 years of age, has been falsely implicated in this case. It is submitted that the petitioner is not involved in any other case under the NDPS Act and was not in conscious possession of the alleged recovery. He also submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join investigation.
4. Notice of motion.



5. On the asking of the Court, Ms. Ramta Chawdhary, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent/State and vehemently opposes the grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner as his custodial interrogation is necessary for proper investigation.

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

7. A bare perusal of the record shows that 5 kg of poppy husk plants were allegedly recovered from the fields belonging to the petitioner, measuring about 50 square yards. Since the alleged recovery of plants was effected from the petitioner's fields, the element of conscious possession and involvement cannot be ruled out at this stage.

8. Moreover, the investigation is still in progress and the nature and extent of the petitioner's involvement is yet to be determined. Therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner appears necessary for a fair and effective investigation.

9. In light of the above, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage as his custodial interrogation is essential for proper investigation in this case.

10. Consequently, the petition is, hereby, dismissed.

11. However, it is clarified that the observations made hereinabove would not have any bearing on the merits of the case.

30.03.2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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