



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.

208

CRM-M-30803-2026 (O&M).
Date of Decision: 02.07.2026.

Vikramjeet Singh
State of Haryana

VERSUS

....Petitioner.
....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Sanjay Khan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjeev Kumar, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of petitioner	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Vikramjeet Singh	54	20.03.2026	18(c) of NDPS Act	Cheeka	Kaithal

2. As per case of the prosecution, on the basis of secret information, raid was conducted and thereupon from the possession of main accused- Baljeet Kumar, opium weighing 509 grams was recovered. After arrest of the said accused, he named the petitioner in his disclosure statement explaining therein that it was the petitioner, who had accompanied him to Madhya Pradesh on 16.03.2026 for procuring the opium.

3. Counsel for the petitioner argues that in fact except of the disclosure statement of main accused Baljeet Kumar, no other evidence is collected warranting involvement of the petitioner in the commission of crime. Quantity of contraband recovered from accused Baljeet Kuma is much less to the even maximum of non commercial quantity i.e. 2.5 kilograms, therefore, the petitioner is ready to join investigation and to fully cooperate.

4. Learned State counsel while opposing the prayer for bail submits that as per disclosure statement and investigation also, petitioner had joined the company of main accused Baljeet Kumar while going to the State of Madhya Pradesh and then coming back and even at the time of purchase of opium both of them were together. As per disclosure statement, some quantity of opium from the purchased opium was also consumed by accused Baljeet Kumar along with the petitioner. Therefore, role of the petitioner cannot be considered as diluted one and no case for grant of anticipatory bail to him is made out.

5. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel.

6. After going through the disclosure statement, this Court does not find much force in the contention of learned State counsel because except of accompanying the main accused Baljeet Kumar to the State of Madhya Pradesh, there is nothing alleging that it was he who got procured the recovered opium from a particular place in the State of Madhya Pradesh. Moreover, proving of the contents recorded in the disclosure statement of accused Baljeet Kumar would be heavily upon the prosecution and until the same are proved, petitioner need not to be put to custodial interrogation.

7. Accordingly, the petition is **allowed** and petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today or as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail, subject to furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not join investigation within aforementioned time, present bail order would be deemed to be inoperative.

8. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

9. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of accordingly.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

02.07.2026
jitender

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