



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

**CRM-M No.31479 of 2026
Date of decision: 29.05.2026**

B. Aprameya

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. Dushyant, Advocate (*joined through VC*) for
Mr. Neeraj Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.) seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.147 dated 24.07.2025 registered under Section 20 of the NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Sector-20, District Panchkula, Haryana. The petitioner prays for grant of pre-arrest bail in the aforesaid case during the course of investigation.

2. Briefly stated, the prosecution case is that on 24.07.2025, information was received by the police from the Security and Vigilance Department of DTDC Express, Panchkula that a suspicious parcel booked from Zirakpur to Bengaluru contained some contraband substance. Acting upon the information and after complying with the requisite procedural formalities under the NDPS Act, the parcel was opened and searched in the



presence of a Gazetted Officer. During the search, a black and brown coloured substance suspected to be Charas was recovered from a camping tent packed inside the parcel. On weighment, the recovered contraband was found to be 157.05 grams, falling within the intermediate quantity category, whereupon the present FIR was registered.

3. During investigation, the petitioner B. Aprameya came to be nominated as an accused. According to the prosecution, the parcel had allegedly been booked using the mobile number of the petitioner and further investigation was undertaken to ascertain the source and destination of the contraband as well as the persons involved in its transportation. On the basis of the aforesaid allegations, the petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail in the present case.

4. It has been argued by learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that the petitioner has not denied that the parcel in question was booked by him. However, it is contended that the mere booking of the parcel does not establish that the contraband allegedly recovered therefrom was placed by the petitioner. Learned counsel submits that there exists a substantial possibility of tampering at the level of the courier company or by third parties while the parcel remained in transit and custody of the courier agency. In support of the aforesaid contention, it has been argued that the prosecution has failed to place on record any complete and unbroken chain of custody showing the movement of the parcel from the collection centre at Zirakpur till its interception at Panchkula. It is further submitted that despite the availability of CCTV cameras and internal



monitoring systems at the courier centres, no comprehensive CCTV footage or movement logs have been produced by the investigating agency to rule out the possibility of tampering or substitution of the contents of the parcel while it remained in the custody of the courier company. Learned counsel has further referred to the WhatsApp conversations exchanged between the petitioner and the DTDC franchise operator to contend that the consignment had already been scanned at the Bengaluru/Yelahanka Apex Hub much prior to the alleged recovery. It is argued that the petitioner was actively tracking the parcel and continuously following up for its delivery, which conduct is wholly inconsistent with that of a person knowingly dispatching contraband. Reliance has also been placed upon various emails sent by the petitioner to DTDC Customer Support complaining about the non-delivery of the consignment and seeking its whereabouts. According to the petitioner, DTDC subsequently informed him that the parcel had become “untraceable in transit” and did not disclose that it had allegedly been intercepted by the police. On the strength of these circumstances, it is argued that the possibility of tampering, substitution of the parcel, manipulation of tracking records, or involvement of third parties cannot be ruled out and, therefore, the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case.

5. Notice of motion.

6. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Sushil Bhardwaj, Addl. A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submitted that the allegations



against the petitioner are serious in nature. It is argued that the petitioner himself booked the parcel in question and also made payment of ₹2,000/- towards the booking charges through his mobile number via Paytm to Jasbir Singh, owner of DTDC, Mohali. It is further submitted that the parcel, upon interception and search, was found to contain 157.05 grams of charas. Learned State counsel contends that the source of the contraband is yet to be ascertained and, therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for a fair and effective investigation. On these grounds, dismissal of the present petition has been sought.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

8. It is not disputed by the petitioner that the parcel in question was booked by him. It is also not denied that an amount of ₹2,000/- towards booking charges was paid through his mobile number via Paytm to Jasbir Singh, owner of DTDC, Mohali. *Prima-facie*, these circumstances establish a direct nexus of the petitioner with the parcel from which 157.05 grams of charas was allegedly recovered.

9. The contention raised on behalf of the petitioner that the parcel might have been tampered with during transit by the courier company or by some third person cannot be accepted at this stage. The said plea is essentially a matter of evidence which can be examined only during trial on the basis of material that may be led by the parties. At this stage, there is no material on record to substantiate the allegation of tampering. Mere apprehension or speculation regarding possible tampering cannot



outweigh the *prima-facie* material collected during investigation.

10. The recovery of contraband from a parcel admittedly booked by the petitioner, coupled with the payment of booking charges by him, necessitates a thorough investigation to ascertain the source of the contraband as well as the entire chain of events leading to its transportation. In such circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioner cannot be said to be unwarranted.

11. Keeping in view the nature of allegations, the recovery effected in the present case, the *prima-facie* involvement of the petitioner and the requirement of custodial interrogation, this Court does not find any ground to extend the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

12. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

13. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

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

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

29.05.2026
neetu

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