



102

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

**CRM-M-55815-2025
DECIDED ON: 27.02.2026**

SATNAM SINGH**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB**.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. Navraj Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.228, dated 24.08.2025, under Sections 21, 29 and 61/85 of NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Dharamkot, District Moga.
2. After hearing counsel for the petitioner, on 01.10.2025, following order was passed by this Court:-

“2. As per the case of the prosecution, on 24.08.2025, 180 grams of heroin was recovered from a polythene packet kept in a motorcycle by the named accused, namely Davinder Singh, Manpreet Singh, and Baldev Singh @ Dev. Subsequent to their arrest on 26.08.2025, petitioner was nominated under Section 29 of the NDPS Act with the allegation that the petitioner supplied the said contraband heroin to the aforementioned accused.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that, except for the disclosure statement of the co-accused, no other evidence has been collected by the prosecution. Counsel submits that, since the petitioner

is already known to the police officials, he has been implicated again merely to increase the number of accused. Furthermore, counsel submits that the petitioner is willing and ready to cooperate with the investigation, provided he is protected from arrest.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent — State.

6. Adjourned to 09.12.2025.

7. In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim 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.).

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.

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

3. When the present petition came up for hearing on 19.02.2026, learned State counsel informed the Court that petitioner had not joined the investigation and had, thus, failed to comply with the directions issued by this Court, vide order dated 01.10.2025.

In response to the said contention, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner had, in fact, gone to join the investigation on 28.11.2025 at about 3:00 P.M. at Police Station Dharamkot, District Moga. However, it was alleged that the Investigating Officer demanded a bribe of Rs.3,000/- from him. Consequently, learned State counsel was directed to verify the contention raised by the

petitioner by examining the mobile location of the petitioner, which he ordinarily carries, and to apprise this Court by filing a report.

4. Today, learned State counsel has filed a short reply by way of affidavit of Jasvarinder Singh, PPS, dated 26.02.2026 in Court, which is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place on the file.

5. Learned State counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to page No.4 of the status report, wherein reply to the specific query raised by this Court, vide order dated 19.02.2026, has been furnished. For reference, the same is reproduced hereunder:-

“8. That on 19.12.2026, this Hon'ble Court was informed that the present petitioner had failed to comply with the order dated 01.10.2025, as he did not join the investigation before the Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner's counsel opposed the same.

9. That further this Hon'ble Court directed to verify the fact with regard to the contention raised by the counsel for the present petitioner that he had gone to join the investigation on 28.11.2025 at about 3:00 PM at Police Station Dharamkot, District Moga, and that the Investigating Officer allegedly demanded a bribe of Rs.3,000/- from him.

10. That to verify the said allegations, both the mobile numbers of the petitioner i.e. 85570-83623 and 98552-28490, which were being used by the present petitioner, were forwarded to the Technical Cell for obtaining Call Detail Records (CDRs) and to ascertain the mobile tower location of the petitioner for the relevant date ie 28.11.2025 at about 03:00 PM as alleged by the petitioner.

11. That after receiving the CDRs of the tower location for the period from 26.11.2025 to 29.11.2025, the scrutiny of the same was done and it was found that both numbers are registered with Airtel company. One mobile number 98552-28490 was switched off during the relevant period, while the other number 85570-83623 remained active. As per the record of mobile No. 85570-83623 on 28.11.2025, From

Morning to 12:20/PM the location of petitioner remained at village Lopo (Badhni kalan), between 1:00 PM and 3:00 PM, the petitioner was located in Jagraon City. After 3:00 PM, his movement was recorded between villages Kaunke, Dangian, and Mallah until approximately 4:00 PM, and thereafter at Village Lopo (Badhni Kalan). The location data clearly establishes that the petitioner never came to Police Station Dharamkot, District Moga, on 28.11.2025 to join the investigation.

8. That it is further submitted that the petitioner's recorded location was approximately 30-35 kilometers away from Police Station Dharamkot, District Moga, during the relevant time. Since the petitioner never appeared before the Investigating Officer on 28.11.2025, there was no occasion for the Investigating Officer to demand any bribe of Rs. 3,000/-.

9. That on the basis of the above said technical data, the allegations leveled by the present petitioner have been found to be false, baseless, and fabricated. The petitioner has failed to comply with the order dated 01.10.2025 passed by this Hon'ble Court and, as such, does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

10. That the deponent has great respect for this Hon'ble Court and the Order dated 19.02.2026 has been duly complied with. The deponent will make sure that all the orders passed by this Hon'ble Court are complied with in future also."

6. In view of the explanation furnished by learned State counsel in the status report, this Court is of the firm opinion that petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail, because petitioner has made a blatantly false statement before this Court and has thereby attempted to mislead the Court by conveying incorrect information through his counsel.

7. In light of the above, present petition stands **dismissed**.

8. However, Investigating Officer is directed to take necessary steps to arrest the petitioner forthwith, strictly in accordance with law.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

27.02.2026
Lavisha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>