



CRM-M-30509-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Sr. No.224

Case No. : CRM-M-30509-2025

Decided On : July 03, 2025

Gurpreet Singh alias Gopi Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR.

* * *

Present : Mr. Prince Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P. S. Pandher, AAG, Punjab.

* * *

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. :

Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.107 dated 13.12.2024, under Sections 21(C)/29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as – NDPS Act) and under Section 10/11/12 of the Air Craft Act, 1934, registered at Police Station Valtoha, District Tarn Taran.

Shorn of unnecessary details, the prosecution version, in brief, is that during routine checking, three accused persons namely Gurjant Singh, Amandeep Singh and Balbir Singh were arrested for having commercial quantity of heroin in their possession. During investigation, name of the petitioner Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi cropped up on the basis of



disclosure statement made by co-accused Gurjant Singh, who was found in possession of 504 grams of heroin and Amandeep Singh @ Kaka, who was found in possession of 497 grams of heroin.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that no recovery had been effected from the petitioner and he has no direct or indirect involvement with the offence allegedly committed in the present case. He was nominated as accused in the FIR, only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, who were arrested by the police and as such, disclosure statement of co-accused is not admissible in law. The prosecution story is highly improbable and unnatural. The petitioner is ready and willing to join investigation and thus, has prayed that he be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

Learned State counsel, on the other hand, while opposing the present bail petition, contended that the petitioner has been specifically named in the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required and granting him bail would hamper the investigation and it would not be possible to unearth the truth regarding source and supply of contraband in question.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State Counsel and have also gone through the record.

Name of the petitioner surfaced during investigation of the case when he was named by co-accused Amandeep Singh @ Kaka in his disclosure statement, suffered before the Investigating Officer. As per aforesaid disclosure statement, the petitioner is alleged to be the prospective purchaser of the contraband/heroin recovered in the present case and he had



asked the main accused to arrange for ½ kg of heroin for selling the same to different customers. As per the disclosure statement, the main accused were waiting for the petitioner in the grain market to sell the heroin for Rs.16 lakhs per kg, when they were caught with the said heroin. Another co-accused Balvir Singh also suffered disclosure statement before the Investigating Officer, which is the corroborative version of the earlier disclosure statement suffered by Amandeep Singh @ Kaka. Thus, as per the disclosure statement, the petitioner was a part of larger supply chain of contraband and his custodial interrogation is required in the present case in order to bring the present case to its logical conclusion. Thus, no ground is made out to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

July 03, 2025

monika

**(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>
<i>Whether reportable ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>