



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

**CRM-M No.25690 of 2026  
Date of decision: 12.05.2026**

**Gurdeep Singh @ Diler**

**...Petitioner**

**Versus**

**Union of India**

**...Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU**

Present :- Mr. Kshitiz Goel, Advocate and  
Mr. Krishan Kanha, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sharma, Special Public Prosecutor, NCB with  
Mr. Vinayak Atre, Advocate  
for the respondent.

\*\*\*\*\*

**MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)**

1. This is the first petition filed under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 (corresponding Section 438 Cr.P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing NCB Crime No.44 dated 21.11.2024 under Sections 8, 21, 23, 25, 29 and 60 of the NDPS Act, Police Station Narcotics Control Bureau, Amritsar Zonal Unit, Amritsar.
2. Briefly stated, as per NCB Crime Report, a secret information was received from Sh. Kuleep Malik, DC(G) 144 Bn. BSF that the troops of BOP, Pulmoran, 100 Battalion, BSF had recovered 04 packets of suspected heroin, 01 drone, 01 motorcycle and drug money of approximately Rs.1,50,000/- and also apprehended 03 persons in their AOR



and BSF wanted to hand over the same to NCB for further legal proceedings. Acting upon the said information, NCB team seized 2.004 kg Heroin along with a drone, 04 mobile phones, one black splendor motorcycle and Indian currency of Rs.1,87,120/-, which were handed over by BSF and accordingly, NCB Crime No.44 dated 21.11.2024 under Sections 8, 21, 23, 25, 29 and 60 of the NDPS Act was registered against the accused persons, namely Akashdeep Singh, Ajay Dev Singh and Manpreet Singh.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner was arrayed as an accused in the instant case solely on the basis of the disclosure statement made by co-accused Akashdeep Singh. He further submits that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner and no recovery whatsoever has been effected from the present petitioner. Learned counsel also submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and to co-operate with the Investigating Agency.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the NCB has opposed the bail petition on the ground that the alleged contraband, i.e 2.004 kg Heroin, falls within the category of commercial quantity. It is further contended that the allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature. Learned counsel also submits that there is a statutory bar under Section 37 of the NDPS Act for grant of bail and the twin conditions envisaged therein are not satisfied in the present case. It is also argued that in case the petitioner is released on interim bail, there is every likelihood



that he may again indulge in similar illegal activities or may misuse the concession of bail. The petitioner was actively involved in arranging the cross-border procurement of heroin through drones operating from across the Indo-Pak border and was coordinating the delivery of the consignments. It is thus argued that the petitioner does not deserve any leniency and his bail petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel representing the respondent and have carefully gone through the material available on record.

6. The allegations in the present case arise out of recovery of commercial quantity of heroin, thus attracting the rigours of Section 37 of the NDPS Act. As per the prosecution version, the petitioner has been specifically named by the co-accused in their statements recorded under Section 67 of the NDPS Act. The prosecution alleges that the petitioner was actively involved in arranging the cross-border procurement of heroin through drones operating from across the Indo-Pak border and was coordinating the delivery of the consignments.

7. The record further reveals that the co-accused disclosed that the petitioner used to contact them through WhatsApp calls made from virtual numbers and used to convey the location from where the consignments were to be collected. It has also come on record that, acting upon the directions of the petitioner, the co-accused allegedly collected packets of heroin dropped by drones during night hours from the border area and thereafter, concealed the same at different places before effecting



further delivery to other persons. The prosecution has also alleged that the petitioner remained in constant touch with the co-accused regarding movement and delivery of the contraband and had allegedly instructed them regarding distribution of the recovered packets.

8. At this stage, this Court is of the considered opinion that the allegations disclose prima facie involvement of the petitioner in a well-organized drug trafficking network having cross-border ramifications, which cannot be taken lightly. The investigation is still at a crucial stage and custodial interrogation of the petitioner appears necessary for unearthing the larger conspiracy and for tracing the links of other persons involved in the alleged offence.

9. Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the accusations, the quantity of contraband involved and the statutory embargo contained under Section 37 of the NDPS Act, this Court does not find any ground for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

10. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

11. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

12. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

12.05.2026

neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)  
JUDGE

*Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No*  
*Whether Reportable: Yes/No*