



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

(106)

**CRM-M-18940-2026
DATE OF DECISION: 08.04.2026**

RamPetitioner

VERSUS

State of HaryanaRespondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Mohan Singh Chauhan, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr.DAG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. This is the first petition filed under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.478 dated 19.12.2025, under Sections 21 of NDPS Act (Section 29 of the NDPS Act, added lateron), registered at Police Station Ambala Cantt. District Ambala, Haryana (Annexure P-1/T).

2. Brief facts of the case are that on 19.12.2025, on secret information, police apprehended co-accused Lakhan Sonkar and Rohit Sachdeva @ Rinku Billa and recovered 13.53 grams of heroin/smack from Lakhan Sonkar. During investigation, on the basis of successive disclosure statements of co-accused Lakhan Sonkar, Rohit Sachdeva @ Rinku Billa, Manish @ Thungi and Akash @ Sagar, the present petitioner Ram has been nominated as the supplier of the contraband.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in this case on the basis of disclosure statement; that nothing has been recovered from the present petitioner; that co-accused



Manish @ Thungi was initially nominated as the supplier, who further nominated Akash @ Sagar, and co-accused Akash @ Sagar further nominated present petitioner, Ram; petitioner is the fourth one who is nominated in this matter and relied upon the law laid down by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court passed in **Raja versus State of Punjab (Punjab and Haryana) Law Finder Doc ID3 2769390** and **Satpal Singh @ Satta versus State of Punjab (Punjab and Haryana); Law Finder Doc ID # 2781361.**

4. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr.DAG, Haryana, appeared and opposed the petition by submitting that the present petitioner is actively involved in drug trafficking and already five cases of criminal activities are pending against him out of which three are under NDPS Act; that in the disclosure statement of co-accused, specific details were given regarding petitioner's residence, phone number and the amount which he received in lieu of supplying the contraband; that petitioner is required for custodial interrogation to know the source of drugs and to collect the evidence for the success of the prosecution case. Hence, prayer for dismissal of the petition has been made.

5. Heard.

6. Taking into consideration the contentions of the learned counsel for the parties, facts and circumstances of the case and the allegations against the present petitioner, that he is supplier of the contraband recovered; as submitted by learned State counsel, the disclosure statement of co-accused contains specific allegation that petitioner sold 16 gms of Heroin



for an amount of Rs.19,200/- and mobile no. is 8410966666 is also mentioned which belongs to the petitioner; petitioner does not have clear and clean antecedents, as he is involved in five more cases, out of which three are under NDPS Act; custodial interrogation of petitioner is necessary for recovery of the drug money as well as to trace the source of the contraband, hence, anticipatory bail cannot be granted to the petitioner

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 that the petitioner is not entitled for grant of discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.

10. Hence, the present petition stands dismissed.

08.04.2026 (SUBHAS MEHLA)
mamta JUDGE

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