



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

104

CRM-M-22906-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 24.04.2026

Ranjit Singh @ Rana

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Yajur Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been styled as a first petition for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.138 dated 04.07.2022 registered under Section 22 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Lopoke, District Amritsar Rural.

2. The case in hand is a case of chance recovery wherein 1780 loose intoxicant tablets were recovered from a polythene envelope kept in the car being driven by the petitioner. The petitioner was accordingly arrested on 04.07.2022, however, as the FSL report had not been received, the petitioner moved an application for grant of interim bail and vide order dated 29.08.2022, he was granted the concession of interim bail, on the following conditions:-

“6. *Perusal of the police file reveals that applicants were arrested on 04.07.2022. Recovery of 1780 intoxicant*

tablets was effected from accused/applicant Ranjit Singh @ Rana. Since, the applicant is in judicial custody since 04.07.2022 and the report from the office of FSL has not yet been received. In view of the ratio of Crl. Misc. no. 1389 of 2013 Ravinder Singh alias Rinku Vs. State of Punjab and Crl. Misc. No. 13140 of 2012 Inderjeet Singh @ Laddi v. State of Punjab, decided on 31.1.2014, interim bail is granted to the applicant/accused on their furnishing bail bonds in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like amount each to the satisfaction of Trial court/Ilaqa/Duty Magistrate, subject to the following conditions:-

- A. That the applicant shall appear before the Trial Court on each and every date of hearing.*
- B. That the applicant shall not directly or indirectly induce or coerce any witness of prosecution so as to dissuade him from deposing as witness in the Court.*
- C. That the applicant shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court.*
- D. In addition to the above referred directions, in view of the outbreak of Corona Virus (COVID-19), the applicants are also directed to maintain social distancing and to obey the guidelines issued in this regard by the competent authorities during continuance of such outbreak.*

In case, on receipt of the report of FSL, if the recovery of contraband is found to be falling within the ambit of commercial quantity as reflected in the schedule appended with NDPS Act on receipt of report of Chemical Examiner, the

applicant shall surrender before this court and their interim bail shall be deemed to have been cancelled. With such directions this bail application stands disposed of. Police record be returned and the file of this bail application be attached with the remand papers”.

3. It is further undisputed that the conditions imposed by the Judge, Special Court, Amritsar in his order dated 29.08.2022 were challenged by the petitioner by means of CRM-M-6135-2025 titled as ‘Ranjit Singh @ Rana Vs. State of Punjab’. The said petition was dismissed as withdrawn before a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 24.03.2025 after the matter had been heard at length.

4. An argument has been advanced by the counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner had in the meanwhile been granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 08.07.2024 in bail application bearing No.BA/7502/2024 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar and he was required to surrender before the Court within a period of 15 days and to furnish bail bonds whereupon he was to be released. He contends that the petitioner thereafter appeared before the Court, surrendered and also furnished the bail and surety bonds. The trial commenced further for recording of prosecution evidence. It is submitted that as the petitioner had been granted the concession of anticipatory bail, hence, his further arrest ought not to have been attempted. It is submitted that apprehending his arrest, the petitioner later filed bail application bearing No.3623 of 2026 in the Court of Judge, Special Court, Amritsar, however, the same was dismissed vide order dated 17.04.2026 which such order of

dismissal is an illegality and perversity since anticipatory bail had already been granted to the petitioner directing him to surrender before the trial Court which such condition was duly fulfilled by him.

5. Counsel for the petitioner has, however, been confronted with the order of the anticipatory bail passed in bail application bearing No.BA/7502/2024 dated 08.07.2024. It is evident from a perusal of the same that after the grant of interim bail in 2022, the petitioner had absented on a date of hearing i.e. 11.03.2024 whereupon his bail was cancelled and non-bailable warrants had been issued. The aforesaid anticipatory bail application had infact been filed by the petitioner aggrieved of the cause of action whereby non-bailable warrants had been issued after cancellation of his bail . The said order granting anticipatory bail was thus only in the context of the issuance of the non-bailable warrants pursuant to his absence on 11.03.2024 and is not an order granting anticipatory bail in general. It seems that a mischievous portrayal is being sought to be attempted by the petitioner in order to take benefit of the mirage which is being sought to be created by multiplicity of orders obtained by him. Significantly, the order dismissing the petition filed for challenging the conditions imposed in the order granting interim bail vide order dated 29.08.2022 was itself dismissed on 24.03.2025 by this Court. Hence, the rigors of the order of interim bail dated 29.08.2022 would become applicable against the petitioner having been upheld and affirmed by this Court. In the said circumstances, the present petition is apparently a mischievous attempt by the petitioner to wriggle out of the said conditions despite they having attained finality. The present petition for grant of anticipatory bail, in the circumstances where the

arrest is being sought in compliance of an order granting interim bail to the petitioner would not be maintainable.

6. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed at this stage with a cost of Rs. 10,000/- for the mischievous attempt made by the petitioner. The cost as imposed be deposited with the Poor Patient Welfare Fund (PPWF) of Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education & Research, Chandigarh.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

24.04.2026
Mangal Singh

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