

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:140873



107

CRM-M-56852-2025 (O&M)  
Date of decision:09.10.2025

Ramandeep Singh @ Raman

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

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

Ms. Ramta Chowdhary, DAG, Punjab.

...

**Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).**

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of the BNSS seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No.37, dated 22.03.2025, under Sections 21 and 23 of the NDPS Act (offence under Section 18 of the NDPS Act was added lateron), registered at Police Station Sadar Ferozepur, District Ferozepur.

2. As per the allegations, on 22.03.2025, on receipt of a secret information to the effect that some drone activity had taken place in the vicinity of Police Station Sadar Ferozepur on the previous night and search was being conducted by the authorities of BSF and the concerned Police station and further that the petitioner and his father Jasbir Singh had received contraband supplied through drone from the cross border country Pakistan and had kept the same concealed in their house, a raiding party was

formed which reached after seeking information to the police station and the same conducted search in the house of the petitioner and recovered 1 kg 55 grams of heroin and 1 kg 970 grams of opium from the house of the petitioner. FIR was registered. The petitioner and his father were nominated as accused. They had managed to abscond. Investigation proceedings are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner has filed an application for grant of pre-arrest bail, which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozpur vide order dated 05.08.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. False recovery has been planted. He is only 18 years old youth and has been implicated along with his father. He had no hand in commission of the subject crime. He has clean antecedents. He is ready to join the investigation. No recovery is to be effected from him as the same already stands effected. His custodial interrogation is not required. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Learned State counsel has advance notice of the petition and is ready to argue the matter. It is submitted by him that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner, who had allegedly kept commercial quantity of heroin and opium in his house. His custodial interrogation is must for conducting thorough investigation in the matter and for eliciting information and to the source of the contraband. There is no exceptional and extraordinary circumstance for grant of bail. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. The petitioner along with his father is alleged to have kept 1 kg 55 grams of heroin and 1 kg and 970 grams of opium in his house. The case is at its nascent stage. For conducting thorough and proper investigation in the matter, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. Even otherwise, the petitioner has failed to make out any case for showing that there is any exceptional or extraordinary circumstance making out a case for grant of pre-arrest bail in his favour. It is well settled that anticipatory bail to an accused can be granted in exceptional circumstances only as a person couched in comparative safety of pre-arrest bail would certainly not disclose all the facts within his knowledge. In case custodial interrogation of the petitioner is denied to the Investigating Agency, that shall leave many glaring loopholes and gaps, thereby adversely effecting the investigation.

7. In view of the above discussed facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

9. It is, however, clarified that nothing stated above shall have any bearing on merits of the case.

10. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

**(MANISHA BATRA)**  
**JUDGE**

**09.10.2025**

*harjeet*

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