



CRM-M-40517-2025

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

CRM-M-40517-2025  
DECIDED ON: 29.07.2025

RANJIT SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Ms. Komal Balain, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

**SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)****1. Relief Sought**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.87 dated 09.09.2024 registered under Sections 22 and 29 of NDPS Act at P.S. Banur District SAS Nagar, Mohali.

**2. Contention****On behalf of the petitioner**

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as he has been nominated in the instant FIR on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Gaurav Sharma and the evidentiary value of the same is of weak nature. He further undertakes on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating officer concerned.

Notice of motion.



CRM-M-40517-2025

**On behalf of the State**

On the asking of Court, Mr. J.S.Rattu, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. He, on instructions from SI Bahadev Rath submits that the contraband recovered from the co-accused is commercial in nature and the petitioner is involved in three other criminal cases. He, however, does not controvert the fact that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused Gaurav Sharma, who has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

**4. Analysis**

Be that as it may, considering the fact that the petitioner was nominated as an accused only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, the evidentiary value of which is weak nature. Moreover, the co-accused namely Gaurav Sharma has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by the trial Court vide order dated 19.11.2024 (Annexure P-9) and also considering the undertaking given before this Court that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigation officer concerned.

**5. Decision**

In the light of above, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of seven days from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-



CRM-M-40517-2025

*“When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-*

*(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*

*(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*

*(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;*

*(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’*

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of seven days, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

**(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)**  
**JUDGE**

**29.07.2025**

*Sonia*

*Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No*

*Whether reportable Yes/No*