



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh**

103

CRM-M-66002-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 13.01.2026

Karamveer Singh @ Rahul ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Nitin Verma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0396 dated 14.09.2025, registered under Sections 21(c), 27(a) of NDPS Act and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station City Faridkot.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as the alleged occurrence is stated to have occurred at Faridkot at 04:20 p.m. whereas petitioner was present at Moga between 04:00 p.m. to 06:00 p.m., which is supported by CCTV footage of a cafe and a temple/dera. The only basis for arraying the petitioner as accused is disclosure statement of co-accused, which is inadmissible in evidence. Nothing is to be recovered from the present petitioner and he has clean and clear antecedents. He is ready and willing to



join the investigation, hence, learned counsel prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

3. Status report by way of an affidavit of Sh. Tarlochan Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Faridkot, District Faridkot, Punjab along with Annexures R-1/1T and R-1/2T has been filed and the same are taken on record. Learned State counsel opposed the present petition by submitting that allegations against the present petitioner are serious in nature as recovery of 280 grams of 'heroin', two digital weighing scales, 1 country made pistol, 5 live cartridges and Rs.5100/- have been made from co-accused. Three co-accused were apprehended on the spot, however, present petitioner managed to flee from the spot. As per reply, he submits that the role of the present petitioner is that he is one of the active associate member of the group, who indulged in smuggling of heroin and ran away from the spot. With respect to the contention of plea of alibi supported by CCTV footage raised by the petitioner, statement of Kamalpreet Singh, owner of Crispy Hawkers Cafe (Annexure R-1/1T) and statement of Govind Puri Chela Baba Roshan Puri Chho Sewa Giri (Annexure R-1/2T) were brought to notice of Court. As per Annexure R-1/1T, owner of cafe has stated that the CCTV footage attached by the petitioner was taken in his absence, and was given by an employee, and that he cannot confirm the accuracy of the same; many customers come to his cafe and hence, he cannot identify the petitioner. Further, as per Annexure R-1/2T, it has been stated by the concerned person that the cameras of the Dera have been malfunctioning, and do not display the accurate time and date; the footage was obtained in his absence, and cannot confirm accuracy of same. The said CCTV footage cannot be relied upon



without obtaining an FSL report qua these footages. The petitioner is involved in one more case of similar nature; and he is required to ascertain the source of contraband, hence, learned State counsel prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the facts of the present case and contentions of learned counsel for the parties; as the allegations against the present petitioner are serious in nature; recovery of 280 grams of 'heroin', falls under commercial quantity; and recovery of two digital weighing scales, 1 country made pistol, 5 live cartridges and drug money of Rs.5100/- have been made. As per prosecution version, the present petitioner fled away from the spot and the petitioner along with co-accused were carrying out these activities near a school; and the petitioner also involved in one more case of similar nature. In view of the reply filed by learned State counsel, the role of the present petitioner that he is one of the active associate member of the group, who indulged in smuggling of heroin and ran away from the spot and statements of both the establishments have been recorded to the effect that the CCTV footages were obtained in their absence, and they could not verify accuracy of the same. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to ascertain the source of contraband, and to effect proper investigation and an in-depth probe in the modus operandi of the accused, and for recovery of drug money. Hence, this Court does not find any merit in the present petition seeking anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has emphasised the importance of custodial interrogation in case titled as '**CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR**



Supreme Court 3806’ decided on 03.08.1997, by holding that many useful informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

7. Honble Apex Court in **Anarul S.K. Vs. The State of West Bengal (SLP (Crl.) No.12621-2024** has observed that the grant of anticipatory bail in cases involving Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (NDPS) is a very serious issue.

8. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.

9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

13.01.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No