



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

101-1

CRM-M-38058-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 16.04.2026

Mandeep Singh @ Anshul Rana

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Prateek Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.170 dated 22.06.2025 registered under Sections 22C, 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station Mullana, District Ambala.

2. Briefly stated, the facts giving rise to the present proceedings are that on 22.06.2025, a police patrolling party headed by ASI Surender Kumar of the Haryana State Narcotics Control Bureau, Unit Kurukshetra, acting upon secret information, intercepted a motorcycle bearing registration No. HR-54D-9845, being driven by one Paramjit Singh @ Pamma. Upon search, 62 strips of Spaspeace capsules (in all 494 capsules), containing the salts Acetaminophen, Tramadol and Dicyclomine were recovered from his

possession. The total weight of the recovered capsules was found to be 263.7 grams. Thereafter, the disclosure statement of the said Paramjit Singh @ Pamma was recorded, wherein he stated that he had procured the aforesaid capsules from Mandeep Singh @ Anshul Rana, the petitioner herein. In view thereof, Mandeep Singh @ Anshul Rana came to be arrayed as an accused for the commission of offence punishable under Section 29 of the NDPS Act.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused in the present case solely on the disclosure of co-accused/ Paramjit Singh @ Pamma, who was apprehended by the Police with the contraband. He contends that the petitioner and the said co-accused are residents of adjoining villages and have been acquainted since childhood and therefore, their maintaining telephonic contact with each other is neither unusual nor incriminating. Learned counsel submits that the co-accused had, at some point of time, borrowed a certain sum of money from the petitioner, which was subsequently repaid by him by depositing the amount in the bank account of the petitioner's wife. It is contended that the aforesaid transaction has now been sought to be relied upon by the prosecution to allegedly establish a link between the petitioner and co-accused/Paramjit Singh @ Pamma. It is submitted that the said financial transactions was not any consideration for supply of narcotic substances supplied by the petitioner to co-accused/Paramjit Singh @ Pamma but was on account of repayment of amount borrowed by him. It is further submitted that no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. Learned counsel also points out that although

the petitioner was previously implicated in one case, a cancellation report in the said matter has already been submitted by the police.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel, on instructions from Sub-Inspector Sanjay, contends that a commercial quantity of contraband had been recovered from co-accused/Paramjit Singh @ Pamma. It is contended that the said co-accused, in his disclosure statement, specifically named the petitioner as the supplier of the intoxicant capsules. Learned counsel submits that the investigation has further revealed and established various financial transactions between the co-accused and the petitioner. Different amounts were transferred online by the co-accused into the bank account maintained in the name of Deepika, wife of the petitioner, at Gramin Bank Branch Sardaheri, District Ambala. It is also contended that the call detail records also disclose that the petitioner was in telephonic contact with the co-accused, Paramjit Singh @ Pamma on as many as 158 occasions.

5. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended with the instant petition with their able assistance.

6. It is evident from a perusal of the aforesaid argument as well as the reply filed by the respondent-State that commercial quantity of narcotic capsules have been recovered from the co-accused/Paramjit Singh @ Pamma wherein the petitioner is the supplier thereof. The said disclosure is corroborated by the transfer of money into the bank account of the petitioner's wife and also corroborated by the call detail records reflecting a substantial volume of telephonic communication between the petitioner and the co-accused, Paramjit Singh @ Pamma.

7. Despite the petitioner claiming that co-accused had borrowed money from him, the counsel is unable to divulge any further information as to what was the amount borrowed, the purpose behind borrowing, the period for which it was borrowed etc. Failure to clarify these basics reflects towards the submission being an after-thought.

8. Although an explanation has been sought to be offered on behalf of the petitioner on the premise that he and the co-accused, Paramjit Singh @ Pamma, are residents of adjoining villages and have been acquainted since childhood, the sheer volume of telephonic communication inter se between them, over a short time span, casts a serious doubt on the plausibility of such explanation. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner was also asked to give details of any other individual, including within the petitioner's family, with whom he maintained a comparable frequency of telephonic contact; however, counsel was unable to point to any such instance from the record. The aforesaid circumstances, prima facie, indicate the possibility of the petitioner's participation in the alleged offence or at the very least, awareness thereof.

9. Needless to mention that the offences arising under the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 stand on a more stringent footing having regard to their grave societal impact and the complex nature of investigation involved therein. Such cases invariably necessitate a free, fair and unhindered investigation, which often entails tracing the source, supply chain, financial trail and network of persons involved in the illicit trade. In such a backdrop, the grant of a protective umbrella of interim or anticipatory bail at the threshold has the potential to impede the effective

course of investigation, particularly where custodial interrogation may be required to unearth the larger supply network and the chain of distribution.

10. In view of the aforesaid considerations, I am of the opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the relief of anticipatory bail.

11. The present petition is accordingly *dismissed* at this stage.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

16.04.2026
Mangal Singh

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