

2026:PHHC:073110



**IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT
CHANDIGARH**

102

CRM-M-57420-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 11.05.2026

PARAMDEV @ RINKU

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY.

Present: Mr. Nitesh Singhi, Advocate
for the petitioner, (through VC).

Mr. B.S. Saroha, DAG, Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0130 dated 07.06.2025, under Sections 15(c) of the NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Ukiana, District Hisar.

2. Learned counsel submits that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner, who had been named by the co-accused, Ranjeet Singh in his disclosure statement. He is involved in one more case under NDPS Act, wherein he is on regular bail, thus, seeks concession of anticipatory bail.

3. Learned State Counsel, on the other hand, submits that the petitioner had been granted interim bail, however he did not join the investigation, despite being informed telephonically, whereafter, he was even granted one more opportunity to do so vide order dated 24.04.2026 and notice

dated 25.04.2026 was served to the petitioner, received by his wife, but still he did not join. Even otherwise, commercial quantity of contraband was recovered from the co-accused, who had specifically named the petitioner to be the one who financed and directed the transportation of the same and there are not only multiple calls exchanged, but bank transactions between them too. Moreover, he is involved in one more case under the NDPS Act. His custodial interrogation is stated to be essential to unearth the entire nexus and *modus operandi* involved in the inter-State racket of smuggling and financing of narcotic substances

4. Heard.

5. It would be apposite to refer to relevant paras of the reply dated 13.11.2025, filed by way of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Haryana State Narcotic Control Bureau, Hisar, which read thus:

“3. That after registration of F.I.R., investigation was entrusted to ASI Ashok Kumar No. 1155/Sirsa and during investigation spot memo was prepared by the Investigating Officer and on 07.06.2025, accused Ranjeet Singh was arrested in accordance with Law and on 07.06.2025, accused Ranjeet Singh suffered disclosure statement regarding his involvement in the present case alongwith co-accused Bhagwati Lal alias Raju and Rinku (petitioner-accused Paramdev alias Rinku). During investigation, 6 days police remand of co-accused Ranjeet Singh was obtained and during police remand, on 08.06.2025, co-accused Ranjeet Singh again made detailed disclosure statement (Annexure R-1) wherein he disclosed that "he frequented stays in hotels in Mangalwad for meals or overnight stays, where he established contact with co-accused Bhagwati Lal alias Raju, who is involved in the trade of poppy husk and subsequently co-accused Bhagwati Lal alias Raju introduced co-accused Ranjeet Singh with Rinku alias Paramdev (petitioner-accused) son of Mastram, resident of village Kotli Gaushpur, police station Sadar, district Hoshiarpur, Punjab. He further disclosed that Rinku alias Paramdev (petitioner-accused) proposed that if he (co-accused Ranjeet Singh) desired to earn money, he could transport poppy husk concealed within his vehicle during his trips between Punjab

and Rajasthan, offering a remuneration of Rs. 500 per kilogram on which, he (co-accused Ranjeet Singh) commenced transporting poppy husk for Rinku alias Paramdev (petitioner). He further disclosed that communications pertaining to these activities were conducted via WhatsApp calls between petitioner-accused Rinku alias Paramdev's mobile number (7589792443) and his (co-accused Ranjeet Singh's mobile numbers 7310811367, 7497011367). He further disclosed that payments for these illicit transports were deposited by Rinku alias Paramdev (petitioner-accused), either from his personal account or his wife namely Rani's account and occasionally disbursed in cash. Co-accused Ranjeet Singh further disclosed that after loading his vehicle in Rajasthan, he would routinely stop for meals or overnight stays at the Hotel Radha Krishna, owned by co-accused Bhagwati Lal alias Raju and co-accused Ranjeet Singh began procuring poppy husk from Raju alias Bhagwati. He further disclosed that co-accused Bhagwati Lal alias Raju provided his WhatsApp number 9358956619 and loaded the poppy husk into his at his hotel. Co-accused Ranjeet Singh further disclosed that he used to made payments to Raju alias Bhagwati either in cash or as per instructions, via transfers to the account of Ramlal Mali son of Jogalal Mali and occasionally, Rinku alias Paramdev (petitioner-accused) would directly coordinate with co-accused Bhagwati Lal alias Raju and facilitate payments to him. Co-accused Ranjeet Singh has identified photograph of petitioner-accused Rinku alias Paramdev from his WhatsApp profile, which has been duly printed. He further disclosed that on 02.02.2025, he (co-accused Ranjeet Singh) loaded 500 sacks of stone powder into his vehicle from Udaipur. Subsequently, on 04.06.2025, while co-accused Ranjeet Singh was at Radha Krishna Hotel of co-accused Bhagwati Lal alias Raju, during the same night, co-accused Bhagwati Lal alias Raju Lal loaded poppy husk into the truck of co-accused Ranjeet Singh. The payment for this particular consignment was to be made directly by Rinku alias Paramdev (petitioner-accused) to co-accused Bhagwati Lal alias Raju Lal.

4. That in pursuance of his disclosure statement, co-accused Ranjeet Singh also got identified the location i.e. Reliance Factory, Adamwal, Hoshiarpur where accused Ranjeet Singh was to deliver the doda post to petitioner-accused Paramdev alias Rinku. True translation of demarcation memo is annexed herewith as Annexure R-2.

5. That during investigation, Investigating Officer captured photographs/screen shots from mobile phone of co-accused Ranjeet Singh including photograph of Rinku alias Paramdev (petitioner-accused) and co-accused Bhagwati Lal alias Raju and screen shot of WhatsApp call made with Rinku alias Paramdev (petitioner-accused) and Raju alias Bhagwati, screen

shots of money sent by Rinku alias Paramdev (petitioner-accused) to co-accused Ranjeet on Phonepe, on which, co-accused Ranjeet Singh also appended his signature and same were taken into police possession. On perusal of the above screen shots, it has been found that on 04.06.2025, co-accused Ranjeet Singh have several whatsapp call with co-accused Bhagwati Lal alias Raju Lal on mobile number 93589-56619. Moreover, there also several whatsapp call between co-accused Ranjeet Singh and Rinku alias Paramdev (petitioner-accused) alias Parmamdev on mobile number 7589792443 on 31.05.2025, 01.06.2025, 02.06.2025, 03.06.2025, 05.06.2025. It has been found that on 28.03.2025, Rinku alias Paramdev (petitioner-accused) alias had sent Rs. 50000/- and on 20.04.2025, Rinku alias Paramdev (petitioner-accused) had sent Rs. 1,00,000/- to co-accused Ranjeet Singh through phonepe. True copy of screen shots are attached herewith as Annexure R-3.

6. That during further course of investigation, investigating officer made correspondence with concerned banks to obtained bank account statements of co-accused Ranjeet Singh, Rinku alias Paramdev (petitioner), Rani wife of Paramdev and Ramlal Mali and on perusal of the bank account statements, it has been found that Rinku alias Paramdev (petitioner-accused) sent total Rs. 10,98,500/- on different dates in the account of co-accused Ranjeet Singh. Apart from this, it has been found that total Rs. 315000/- have been sent by petitioner-accused Paramdev alias Rinku through the saving account of his wife Rani also to the account of co-accused Ranjeet Singh....

XXX

xxxxx

xxxxx

9. That vide order dated 14.10.2025 passed in the present petition, the petitioner-accused Paramdev alias Rinku was directed to join the investigation. However, despite the said direction, the petitioner has failed to join the investigation till 08.11.2025. It is pertinent to mention here that on 30.10.2025, the Investigating Officer informed the wife of the petitioner namely Rani, regarding the interim relief granted to the petitioner and specifically directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation on 02.11.2025. Furthermore, on the same day, after some time, Sunil, brother of the petitioner-accused, telephonically contacted the Investigating Officer and assured that the petitioner would appear and join the investigation on the said date. However, the petitioner-accused Paramdev alias Rinku neither appeared nor joined the investigation on 02.11.2025, and even till i.e. 08.11.2025, has failed to comply with the directions of the Hon'ble Court, nor has he communicated any reason for his non-appearance to the Investigating Officer. In view of the deliberate non-compliance of the court's order and the petitioner's continued evasion from investigation, the interim relief granted to him deserves to be

vacated/cancelled.

10. That petitioner is a habitual offender and already involved in one another case under NDPS Act bearing FIR No. 100 of 2022 under Sections 15/61/85 NDPS Act, Police Station Haryana, District Hoshiarpur (Punjab) which is pending under trial.

11. That it is also pertinent to mention here that during the course of investigation, in above case FIR No. 100 of 2022, registered under Sections 15/61/85 of the NDPS Act at Police Station Haryana, District Hoshiarpur (Punjab), the petitioner was granted bail in the said case and had been regularly filing exemption applications through his counsel. However, upon the petitioner's deliberate evasion of arrest in the present case (FIR No. 130 of 2025 under Section 15(c) NDPS Act, Police Station Uklana, District Hisar), the Investigating Officer, through the Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State of Punjab, moved an application for cancellation of the petitioner's exemption from appearance. Considering the petitioner's intentional avoidance of arrest and non-cooperation in the ongoing investigation, the Hon'ble Court, vide order dated 18.08.2025, was pleased to cancel the bail of the petitioner-accused Paramdev alias Rinku in the aforesaid FIR No. 100 of 2022.

12. THAT THE ROLE OF PETITIONER-ACCUSED
PARAMDEV ALIAS RINKU IS AS UNDER:

That during the course of investigation, the role of petitioner-accused Paramdev alias Rinku, has surfaced as being one of the principal conspirators and financiers in the illicit trafficking of narcotic substances. It has come on record from the disclosure statement of co-accused Ranjeet Singh that the petitioner-accused Paramdev alias Rinku, in connivance with co-accused Bhagwati Lal alias Raju was actively engaged in the business of supplying and financing poppy husk consignments transported between Rajasthan and Punjab. The petitioner-accused Paramdev alias Rinku was instrumental in inducing co-accused Ranjeet Singh to participate in the illegal transportation of contraband by offering him monetary consideration of Rs.500 per kilogram. The petitioner-accused Paramdev alias Rinku further coordinated the procurement, loading, and delivery of poppy husk consignments through telephonic and WhatsApp communications, thereby acting as the key link between the suppliers in Rajasthan and the transporters. It has also been revealed that the petitioner-accused Paramdev alias Rinku managed financial transactions related to the illicit trade both personally and through the bank account of his wife Rani, for facilitating payments to co-accused Ranjeet Singh and others.

13. THAT THE EVIDENCE AGAINST THE PETITIONER-ACCUSED PARAMDEV ALIAS RINKU IS AS UNDER:

That the evidence collected during investigation substantiates the active involvement of petitioner-accused Paramdev alias Rinku in the present case. Co-accused Ranjeet Singh, in his disclosure statement dated 08.06.2025, specifically named the petitioner as the person who financed and directed the transportation of narcotic substances. The investigation has further revealed multiple WhatsApp calls exchanged between the petitioner and co-accused Ranjeet Singh from mobile number 7589792443, and between the petitioner Paramdev alias Rinku and co-accused Bhagwati Lal alias Raju indicating continuous coordination regarding the illegal consignments. Screenshots retrieved from the mobile phone of co-accused Ranjeet Singh show WhatsApp calls, profile photographs, and PhonePe payment receipts, all bearing the petitioner's details. The bank statements obtained during investigation demonstrate that the petitioner transferred various amounts totalling Rs.10,98,500/- from his own account to that of co-accused Ranjeet Singh and an additional Rs.3,15,000/- through the account of his wife Rani, thereby corroborating the money trail linked to the purchase and movement of narcotic substances. The petitioner's persistent evasion from investigation despite court directions, coupled with his involvement in another NDPS case FIR No. 100 of 2022 under Sections 15/61/85 NDPS Act, Police Station Haryana, District Hoshiarpur (Punjab), further reflects his habitual association with the narcotics trade and strengthens the prosecution's case regarding his complicity in the present matter."

6. In **Prabhulal vs. Central Bureau of Narcotics**, SLP (Crl.) 6744-2022 was dismissed vide order dated 14.12.2022, affirming the order of Madhya Pradesh High Court, a case for grant of anticipatory bail, as the Chowkidar had stated that commercial quantity of contraband, it being 37 quintal of poppy husk, was loaded by the said appellant and co-accused in the truck.

7. Though, there is no dispute that the name of the petitioner had surfaced in the disclosure statement of the abovementioned co-accused,

however, in this context also Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **State of Haryana vs. Samarth Kumar**, 2022 (3) R.C.R. (Criminal) 991, had held thus:

“7. The order of the Special Court granting regular bail to the respondents shows that the said order was passed in pursuance of the anticipatory bail granted by the High Court. Therefore, the same cannot be a ground to hold that the present appeals have become infructuous.

8. In cases of this nature, the respondents may be able to take advantage of the decision in Tofan Singh vs. State of Tamil Nadu (supra), perhaps at the time of arguing the regular bail application or at the time of final hearing after conclusion of the trial.

9. To grant anticipatory bail in a case of this nature is not really warranted. Therefore, we are of the view that the High Court fell into error in granting anticipatory bail to the respondents.

10. In view of the above, the appeals are allowed. The impugned orders are set-aside. As a consequence, the Appellant –State is entitled to take steps, in accordance with law.”

8. In **Dinesh Chander vs. State of Haryana**, CRM-M-5507-2025, a case involving recovery of commercial quantity of contraband from the co-accused, on whose disclosure the petitioner therein was nominated, this Court declined to grant anticipatory bail on 05.05.2025 and the SLP (Crl.) 9540-2025, filed against which also came to be dismissed on 07.07.2025, on the ground of there being no error in the same.

9. In the case in hand, the name of the petitioner has surfaced based on the disclosure statement of co-accused, who was apprehended at the spot with commercial quantity of contraband, it being 189 kgs and 930 grams of poppy husk and had categorically named him to be the one on whose instance he was transporting the same. The assertion of the petitioner that merely because his photograph was present in the phone of the co-accused, he was roped in this case is belied from the facts stated in the status report with regard

to call details and bank transactions between them, duly substantiated by Annexure R3. The ground taken that the disclosure statement of co-accused is inadmissible, has no force, in view of the decisions of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the cases of **Samarth Kumar** and **Dinesh Chand** (supra). The investigation is at a nascent stage and his custodial interrogation is imperative so as to complete the chain of supply and also to ascertain the persons who may be involved in this nexus. In case, the petitioner is granted the concession of anticipatory bail then prejudice would be caused to the case of the prosecution.

10. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **P. Chidambaram vs. Directorate of Enforcement**, (2019) 9 SCC 24, had observed that, "Ordinarily, arrest is a part of procedure of the investigation to secure not only the presence of the accused but several other purposes. Power under Section 438 CrPC is an extraordinary power and the same has to be exercised sparingly. The privilege of the pre-arrest bail should be granted only in exceptional cases. The judicial discretion conferred upon the court has to be properly exercised after application of mind as to the nature and gravity of the accusation; possibility of applicant fleeing justice and other factors to decide whether it is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. Grant of anticipatory bail to some extent interferes in the sphere of investigation of an offence and hence, the court must be circumspect while exercising such power for grant of anticipatory bail. Anticipatory bail is not to be granted as a matter of rule and it has to be granted only when the court is convinced that exceptional circumstances exist to resort to that extraordinary remedy."

11. In **Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre vs. State of Maharashtra**,(2011) 1 SCC 694, Hon'ble the Supreme Court while expounding the law on anticipatory bail relied on the parameters evolved by the Constitutional Bench in **Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia vs. State of Punjab**,(1980) 2 SCC 565 and held thus:

- i. The nature and gravity of the accusation and the exact role of the accused must be properly comprehended before arrest is made;
- ii. The antecedents of the applicant including the fact as to whether the accused has previously undergone imprisonment on conviction by a Court in respect of any cognizable offence;
- iii. The possibility of the applicant to flee from justice;
- iv. The possibility of the accused's likelihood to repeat similar or the other offences.
- v. Where the accusations have been made only with the object of injuring or humiliating the applicant by arresting him or her.
- vi. Impact of grant of anticipatory bail particularly in cases of large magnitude affecting a very large number of people.

12. The stringent provisions as contained in the statute, are to deal with the drug menace plaguing the society, as the youth are being led on a path having deleterious effects, thereby destroying the very social fabric.

13. The present is not a case where no specifics regarding the contraband have been provided or mere vague allegations have been made, rather huge quantity of 189 kgs and 930 grams of poppy husk, has been recovered from the co-accused, who has disclosed that, as a matter of fact, it was at the instance of the petitioner, who was the purchaser, that the contraband was being transported from Rajasthan to Punjab by him. Even the money trail stands established as the petitioner had transferred an amount totaling to Rs.10,98,500/- from his own account and Rs.3,15,000/- through

that of his wife Rani, to the account of the aforesaid co-accused, linking the purchase and movement of narcotic substances. He is a habitual offender, already facing trial in a case registered under NDPS Act itself. The conduct of the petitioner that despite having been granted interim anticipatory bail and was directed by this Court to join investigation, for which the time was even extended, however, till date, he has failed to do so, despite notice dated 25.04.2026 having been served on him.

14. In view of the foregoing facts and circumstances and the judgments referred to above, grant of protective umbrella of pre-arrest bail to him will hamper the thorough and effective investigation to discover the *modus operandi* and elicit the truth, that coupled with the apprehension that cannot be ruled out of the petitioner influencing and threatening the witnesses or tampering with the evidence, or fleeing from justice, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to him.

15. As a sequel, the present petition being bereft of merit, is hereby dismissed.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

11.05.2026
Rajender

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