



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

101

**CRM-M-16346-2025
Date of decision: 26.03.2025**

Harpal Singh @ Mehla

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. S.S. Gill, Advocate (through VC)
for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.69 dated 25.02.2025 under Sections 17/61/85 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, 'the NDPS Act') registered at Police Station Ellenabad, District Sirsa.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case during interrogation of co-accused Jagjit Singh, who was allegedly nabbed with 102 grams of opium by the police. It has been contended that the disclosure statement on the basis of which the petitioner has been arraigned as an accused in the present case has poor evidentiary value, hence, on this ground alone the petitioner deserves to be extended the concession of anticipatory bail.

3. Notice of motion.



CRM-M-16346-2025

4. On asking of the Court, Mr. Rahul Mohan, Sr. DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

5. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, by submitting on instructions, that this is not the first time that the petitioner has been booked for offences under the NDPS Act. In the year 2022, two FIRs for offences under the NDPS Act were registered against the petitioner and it is during pendency of those two cases, the petitioner has yet again been involved in the present case and hence, prima facie it points to his active involvement in drug trafficking. Learned counsel for the State has, therefore, prayed for dismissal of the instant petition as custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be necessitated to unearth the entire drug cartel.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

7. The petitioner does indeed come across as a habitual offender as this is the third case under the NDPS Act which has been registered against him. It is also apparent that the petitioner has misused the concession of bail which was granted to him in the earlier two cases registered against him under the NDPS Act, by being yet again involved in another case under the NDPS Act.

8. In the facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The instant petition stands dismissed accordingly.

9. However, it is made clear that anything observed



CRM-M-16346-2025

hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

26.03.2025

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No