2025:PHHC:072228

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

CRM-M-29853-2025
Date of Decision: 27.05.2025

Vipin Kumar Mishra @ Vipin Mishra ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana …Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Ram Kumar Gupta, Advocate and
Mr. Kapil Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Harpreet Kaur, A.A.G., Haryana.

****

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
226	14.05.2025	KUK, District Kurukshetra	18 of NDPS Act

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.

2. In paragraph 14 of the bail petition, the accused declares that he has no criminal antecedents.

3. The facts and allegations are taken from the order dated 20.05.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, (Fast Track Special Court for trial of offences under NDPS Act), Kurukshetra. On 14.05.2025, based on secret information, the Police seized 110 grams opium from the possession of co-accused Ashok Kumar @ Kannu. During custodial interrogation, co-accused Ashok Kumar @ Kannu has suffered a disclosure statement that he along with the petitioner, who is his real brother, were used to bring opium from Uttar Pradesh and other adjoining States. The Investigator claims to have complied with all the statutory requirements of the NDPS Act, 1985, and BNSS, 2023.

4. Based on such confession before the police, the petitioner was arraigned as an accused. Apprehending arrest, he filed for anticipatory bail from the Sessions Court, which denied him bail. Feeling aggrieved, he has invoked the concurrent jurisdiction of

JYOTI
2025.05.28 16:14
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this
order/judgment.

this Court under S. 482 BNSS, 2023.

5. Counsel for the petitioner submits that he would have no objection in case any stringent conditions this Court might put upon the petitioner including surrender of fire arms, if any and in case, petitioner repeats the offence, the State shall file an application for cancellation of bail. He further contends that pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and his family.

6. The State's counsel opposes bail on instructions.

REASONING:

7. The evidence collected so far consists of disclosure statements. Such statements can be proven subject to the mandatory restrictions imposed in S. 25 & 26 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ S. 23 of BSA, 2023.

8. Given this, the rigors of S. 37 of the NDPS Act do not apply in the present case.

9. Section 2 (vii-a) of the NDPS Act defines commercial quantity as greater than the quantity specified in the schedule. Section 2 (xxiii-a) defines a small quantity as a quantity less than the quantity specified in the table of the NDPS Act. The remaining quantity falls in an undefined category, generally called an intermediate quantity. All sections in the NDPS Act specify an offence and mention the minimum and maximum sentence, depending upon the quantity of the substance. The commercial quantity mandates a minimum sentence of ten years of imprisonment and a minimum fine of Rupees One hundred thousand, and bail is subject to the riders mandated in S. 37 of the NDPS Act. When the quantity is less than commercial, the restrictions of Section 37 of the NDPS Act will not attract, and the factors for bail become similar to the offence regular statutes.

10. Pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. The evidence might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or to frame charges, but this Court is not considering the evidence at that stage but is analyzing it for the stage of anticipatory bail. An analysis of the above does not justify custodial interrogation or pre-trial incarceration. Given the undertaking of petitioner that if he again deals in drug and where the quantity involved is more than half of the intermediate or commercial quantity, or violates S. 19, 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, it shall be permissible for the State to file an application for cancellation of bail, petitioner makes out a case for bail.

11. The evidence collected might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or even to frame the charges; however, it is insufficient for the purpose of denying bail.

12. Given the penal provisions invoked, the legal admissibility of evidence collected against the petition, coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations, and

JYOTI
2025.05.28 16:14
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this
order/judgment.

the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or pre-trial incarceration, subject to compliance with the terms and conditions mentioned in this order.

13. Given the above, without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for anticipatory bail. .

14. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, and if the matter is before a Court, then the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Officer/Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

15. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

16. The bail order is subject to the petitioner's complying with the following terms.

17. *The petitioner is directed to join the investigation within seven days of uploading this order on the official webpage of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and as and when called by the Investigator*. The petitioner shall be in deemed custody for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ Section 23 of BSA, 2023. The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as required. In the event of failure to do so, the prosecution will be open to seeking cancellation of the bail. During the investigation, the petitioner shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

18. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

19. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount

JYOTI
2025.05.28 16:14
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this
order/judgment.

to protect the members of society, detection squad and incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report or discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearms. [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of the evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond a reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be construed as an intermediate sanction]. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days of uploading of this order on the official webpage of this Court and inform the Investigator of the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and reclaim them in case of acquittal in this case, provided it is otherwise permissible under the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in the victim(s), their families, and society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

20. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offense in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes a maximum sentence that is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above; then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days, providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

21. In Md. Tajiur Rahaman v. The State of West Bengal, decided on 08-Nov-2024, SLP (Crl) 12225-2024, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds in Para 7, "It goes without saying that if the petitioner is found involved in such like offence in future, the concession of bail granted to him today will liable to be withdrawn and the petitioner is bound to face the necessary consequences."

22. ***This bail is conditional, and the foundational condition is that if the petitioner indulges in any non-bailable offense, the State may file an application for cancellation of this bail before the Sessions Court, which shall have the liberty to cancel this bail***.

23. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

24. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may

JYOTI
2025.05.28 16:14
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this
order/judgment.

download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

25. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

27.05.2025
Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.

JYOTI
2025.05.28 16:14
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this
order/judgment.