



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-44736-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 29.09.2025

SADDAM KHAN

..... Petitioner

*Versus*

STATE OF HARYANA

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

Present : Mr. Mohan Singh Rana, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, DAG, Haryana assisted by  
ASI Manoj.

\*\*\*\*

**YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)**

1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.118 dated 19.05.2025 registered at Police Station Bajghera, District Gurugram, under Sections 21(b), 29(b) of NDPS Act.

2. On 27.08.2025, the following order was passed:-

*“Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.118 dated 19.05.2025 registered at Police Station Bajghera, District Gurugram, under Sections 21(b), 29(b) of NDPS Act.*

*As per prosecution case, one Parveen Yadav was apprehended on 19.05.2025 on the basis of secret*



*information and 188 grams of heroin was recovered from him. On interrogation, he disclosed that the same was purchased by him from Rajesh @ Ravinder, who was also arrested on 28.05.2025. Said Rajesh @ Ravinder disclosed that the petitioner-Saddam Khan is the supplier. Apprehending arrest, the petitioner applied for anticipatory bail, which has been rejected by the trial Court.*

*Notice of motion. Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.*

*Status report dated 26.08.2025 by way of an affidavit of Mukesh Kumar, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Crime II, Gurugram, filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The disclosure statement of co-accused, whereby he has been nominated as an accused is inadmissible in evidence and cannot be looked into. There is no other material to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence and disclosure statement alone cannot be made the basis to deny the benefit of anticipatory bail. Learned counsel next contended that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and he will abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour. In support of his contentions, learned counsel for the petitioner has cited the Judgment reported as Law Finder Doc.id# 2687409, 2025:NCPHHC:2121 titled as “**Sahil Joshi Vs. State of Punjab**”*

*On the other hand, learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Ramdeep Singh has opposed the prayer and argued that the name of the petitioner has*



*emerged during investigation as the main supplier of the contraband and disclosure statement of co-accused Rajesh @ Ravinder has pointed towards his role in the present offence indicating his involvement in the illicit drug network and as such, his custodial interrogation is essential to trace the source from where the contraband was arranged and other links of supply and petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail.*

*Admittedly, no recovery has been effected from the petitioner and he was not named in the FIR. His name has cropped up in the disclosure statement of co-accused Rajesh @ Ravinder, who was also nominated as an accused by main accused Parveen Yadav from whom contraband was recovered. Both Parveen Yadav and Rajesh @ Ravinder have already been released on regular bail by the trial Court. At this stage, there is no other material against the petitioner except disclosure statement of co-accused. There are no call details between the petitioner and both the co-accused to point out towards his involvement. As such, it is a case wherein benefit of anticipatory bail should be extended.*

*Adjourned to 29.09.2025. Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS/438(2) Cr.P.C.”*

3. Today, on instructions from ASI Manoj, learned State counsel has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 27.08.2025 and is no longer required for further investigation.

4. In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 27.08.2025,



whereby the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute. However, he shall continue to join investigation, if and so required by the Investigating Officer.

5. Disposed of.

6. Pending misc application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

**(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)**  
**JUDGE**

29.09.2025

*Ali*

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