



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

108

CRM-M-54697-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 16.03.2026

Lovepreet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. A.S. Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. B.S. Saroha, DAG Haryana

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.111 dated 29.08.2025, registered under Sections 21B/61/85 of NDPS Act, at Police Station Rori, District Sirsa.

2. On 13.10.2025, this Court had passed the following order:-

“1. For the commission of offence punishable under Section 21B of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, hereinafter being referred as “the NDPS Act”, the FIR No. 111 dated 29.08.2025 has been lodged in Police Station Rori, District Sirsa.

2. In the above-mentioned case, the petitioner is apprehending arrest, and therefore, he has approached this Court, by virtue of present petition under Section 482 of BNSS, for the benefit of anticipatory bail.

3. The FIR of this case came into being, when on 28.08.2025 the accused, namely Angrej Singh and Harman Singh were intercepted on the basis of suspicion and after complying with the provisions of Section 50 of the NDPS Act, search of their person was conducted. According to prosecution, on search, 30 grams 59 milligrams of heroin was recovered from their possession, and that on interrogation, the accused, namely Angrej Singh, suffered a disclosure statement, wherein he disclosed that the contraband was supplied to him by the petitioner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Since advance notice has already been served upon the State, Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Additional Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent, and waives service.

6. Heard.

7. It has been contended on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of evidence which is not admissible in evidence, being a confessional statement recorded in police custody. It has also been argued that the quantity of contraband recovered from the main accused is far below the minimum limit prescribed for commercial quantity, and that nothing has been recovered from the possession of petitioner.

8. Per contra, learned State counsel has argued that there is some WhatsApp chat between the petitioner and main accused indicating the delivery of contraband by the petitioner to the main accused, and that in order to extract truth, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

9. The record has been perused carefully.

10. A perusal of the record shows that there are several factors which are required to be taken into consideration at this stage. They are:-

i) that the WhatsApp chat between the petitioner and the main accused nowhere shows that it was with regard to delivery of any sort of contraband by the petitioner to the main accused. The above mentioned WhatsApp chat simply shows that the petitioner and the main accused, namely Angrej Singh are known to each other.

ii) that as stated by the learned State counsel, on the instructions of SI Ran Singh, the petitioner has no criminal history.

iii) that the contraband recovered from the possession of main accused falls within the category of intermediate quantity;

iv) that the only evidence so far available with the Investigating Agency is the confessional statement of co-accused recorded in the police custody. Regarding the above mentioned piece of evidence, there is a serious doubt qua reliability and admissibility;

v) that nothing has been recovered from the possession of accused/petitioner;

vi) that the investigation and trial of the case are not likely to be concluded in near future; And

vii) that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to produce a fruitful result.

11. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the above mentioned factors, it is hereby held that the

petitioner is entitled for interim anticipatory bail.

12. Thus, it is hereby ordered that in the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim anticipatory bail on furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer. He shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

13. List on 10.12.2025.”

3. Learned counsel submits that in pursuance of the afore-mentioned order, the petitioner has not only joined investigation but also fully cooperated with the investigating agency. He further submits that in case the investigating agency requires the petitioner to appear, he shall make himself available without demur.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions affirms the factum of joining the investigation by the petitioner and cooperating with the investigating agency. He also submits that at this stage, the petitioner is not required for further custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner is allowed and the order dated 13.10.2025 granting interim bail to him, is hereby made absolute, subject to compliance of conditions as specified under Section 482(2) BNSS.

6. However, it is made clear that if the petitioner fails to join and cooperate with the investigating agency as and when required, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of the present anticipatory bail granted to him.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

16.03.2026
M.Kamra

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