

2025:PHHC:129791



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

105

**CRM-M No.52315 of 2025
Date of decision: 17.09.2025**

Palminder Singh @ Pinder ... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Puran Singh Hundal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Vikramjeet Singh, Advocate,
Mr. Gursahib Singh Hundal, Advocate and
Ms. Arshpreet Kaur, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, Addl. AG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS") seeking anticipatory bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
0284	23.08.2025	City Mandi Dabwali, District Sirsa	15(c) of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short 'NDPS Act')

2. As per the allegations, on 23.08.2025, a secret information was received by ASI Pritam Singh that one Tarsem Singh was involved in the business of sale of Doda Post and at that point of time, he was present on

2025:PHHC:129791



the road side of Village Desu Jodha. He had kept three gunny bags carrying Doda Post in the same and had covered those bags with a plastic sheet and was intending to sell the same to somebody. It was informed that he could be apprehended with the contraband. Believing the secret information to be true, a raiding party was formed which reached at informed place and found the accused Tarsem Singh standing there. On noticing the police party, he tried to flee. He was apprehended. The plastic cover was removed and three bags were found kept beneath the same. The accused Tarsem Singh admitted that those bags belonged to him but could not give any satisfactory reply about the articles contained therein. After completion of usual formalities, the bags were checked and 53 kgs and 625 grams of Doda Post was recovered from the same, which was taken into possession. The accused Tarsem Singh on interrogation disclosed that he had purchased the contraband from the present petitioner. The petitioner was nominated as an accused. Apprehending his arrest, he moved an application for grant of pre arrest bail which was dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa vide order dated 12.09.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. No recovery is to be effected from him. His custodial interrogation is not

2025:PHHC:129791



required. He is ready to join the investigation. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Apoorv Garg, Addl. AG, Haryana has advance notice of the petition and is ready to argue the matter. It is submitted that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. He is a habitual offender as four more cases under the provisions of NDPS Act have been registered against him. No exceptional and extraordinary circumstance for grant of pre arrest bail is made out. The custodial interrogation of petitioner is must for conducting thorough and proper investigation in the matter. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have supplied contraband of commercial quantity to co-accused Tarsem Singh. He is stated to be involved in four more cases under the NDPS Act. In nutshell, the vital circumstances of the case are: the enormity of intricate web dealing in illegal contraband; status of the investigation being ongoing; recovery of commercial quantity of contraband from the co-accused; requirement of custodial interrogation of the applicant as expressed by the investigating agency and his antecedents.

8. In the absence of any reasonable ground which can satisfy this Court into believing that applicant is not guilty of the offence alleged

2025:PHHC:129791



against him coupled with the fact that no exceptional or extraordinary circumstance for grant of bail is made out, this Court is inclined to hold that the petitioner do not deserve to be extended benefit of pre arrest bail. More so, his custodial interrogation is essential to unravel the larger nexus of drugs supplies and to effect further recoveries. Accordingly, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

9. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

17.09.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No