

2025:PHHC:080589



230.

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

**CRM-M-33056-2025**

Date of decision: 07.07.2025

Paramjit Singh alias Paramjeet Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Vikas Bishnoi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

-----

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, in case FIR No.387, dated 09.05.2025, under Section 21(b) of the NDPS Act, 1985 (during investigation, Section 21(b) of NDPS Act, 1985 deleted and Section 20(b) of NDPS Act added), registered at Police Station Azad Nagar, District Hisar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has advanced the following arguments:-

- That the petitioner has not been named in the FIR in question, annexed as Annexure P-1;
- He was not apprehended at the spot at the time of the alleged recovery;
- No recovery has been effected from the petitioner himself;

- The petitioner has been implicated solely on the basis of disclosure statements made by co-accused persons, who were apprehended at the spot;
- The recovery in the case has already been made and, therefore, nothing further is to be recovered from the petitioner.

3. On being put to notice, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite and has submitted, on instructions, that the petitioner is not an innocent bystander but is alleged to be the original supplier of the contraband substance i.e. 9.62 grams of heroin. Further, it surfaced during the interrogation of the co-accused that the contraband recovered from them was allegedly purchased from the petitioner for a sum of Rs.17,000/-. It has been asserted by the learned counsel for the State that the disclosure statements of the co-accused are not merely speculative, but are supported by further investigation connecting the petitioner to the offence in question. It has also been brought to the notice of this Court by the learned State counsel, on instructions, that the petitioner is a habitual offender and is already involved in one other case under the NDPS Act, in which he was granted bail but has evidently misused the liberty so granted.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

5. This Court finds that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and cannot be brushed aside at this stage. Prima facie, the

petitioner appears to be the alleged supplier of the contraband in question. The specific role attributed to the petitioner, as being the origin of the illicit substance, places him in a different footing compared to that of a mere purchaser or carrier.

6. The contention that the petitioner was not apprehended at the spot and that no recovery needs to be made from him does not, by itself, dilute the gravity of the allegations, especially when the investigation points towards his active role in the supply chain of narcotics.

7. Further, the involvement of the petitioner in a previous case under the NDPS Act, and the allegations that he has misused the concession of bail granted to him therein, clearly raises a reasonable apprehension that he may again abuse the process of law if released on bail.

8. Given the nature of the offence, the role attributed to the petitioner, the gravity of the allegations, and his past conduct, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

9. Present petition stands dismissed accordingly.

10. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

**July 07, 2025**  
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No