



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

105

CRM-M-37993-2025
Decided on: 26.02.2026

KARANDEEP SINGH
.....Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF HARYANA
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Vishal Sharda, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

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 (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Karandeep Singh	308	18.06.2025	21b/61/85 of NDPS Act	Sirsa City	Sirsa

2. While recording the contentions addressed by counsel for the petitioner, on 21.07.2025, following order was passed:-

“2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that, according to the case of the prosecution, 25.053 grams of heroin was recovered from one Rahul Dhingra. As per the FIR, when accused Rahul Dhingra was arrested and interrogated, he disclosed that the contraband was delivered to him by an unknown person who stated that it had been sent by Karan, son of Gurjeet Singh. Counsel submits that there is neither any relationship nor any deal between



the petitioner and main accused-Rahul Dhingra. Moreover, the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case solely because he is already known to the police due to involvement in four other criminal cases. There is no specific reason necessitating his interrogation. Counsel submits that petitioner is ready and willing to cooperate with the investigation officer and to join the investigation, whenever required. Accordingly, he prays for the grant of anticipatory bail.

Notice of motion.

On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State. He seeks some time to file reply.

3. Learned State Counsel is directed to file status report on or before the next date of hearing.

4. Adjourned to 11.09.2025.

5. Till the next date of hearing, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed. However, the issue of the petitioner's joining the investigation will be examined after considering the reply of the respondent/State."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner reiterates his submission that except of the disclosure statement, there is no other connecting evidence collected by the prosecution during the course of investigation. Moreover, petitioner is ready to join investigation and fully cooperate, if protected from arrest by this Court. Thus, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel places reliance upon paragraph No.5 of the status report dated 03.09.2025, and submits that one mobile phone bearing sim No.99887-88868, registered in the name of one Arshdeep Singh, was being used by the petitioner and by using the said mobile phone, petitioner was in contact with the main accused namely Rahul Dhingra, from whom 25.53 grams of heroin has been recovered.



Further submits that even when Arshdeep Singh joined the investigation, he told that the said mobile phone was being used by the present petitioner.

5. Responding to the contentions addressed by learned State counsel, counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated. Moreover, the said mobile phone bearing sim No.99887-88868, was never used by the petitioner, and even if the contention made by learned State counsel is accepted, the same is not enough to assume that it was the petitioner only, who supplied the recovered heroin to the main accused Rahul Dhingra.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

7. Undoubtedly, case of the prosecution rests primarily on the disclosure statement of the main accused, namely Rahul Dhingra, from whom 25.53 grams of heroin was allegedly recovered, and on his purported connection with a person using mobile number 99887-88868. It is pertinent to note that recovery effected in the present case is significantly below the commercial quantity threshold of 250 grams, and the said recovery has been made solely from the main accused.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, and for the purpose of investigation, this Court does not find any substantial or compelling reason to subject the petitioner for custodial interrogation. Accordingly, this Court deems it appropriate to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner in the present case.

9. Therefore, petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating



CRM-M-37993-2025

4

agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

10. 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.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

11. With the directions issued here above, present petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

26.02.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO