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

**105**

**CRM-M-51287-2026 (O&M)**
**Date of decision: 10.09.2026**

**PARGAT SINGH**

**PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF HARYANA**

**RESPONDENT**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL**

Present: Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate and
Mr. Navtej Singh Sra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana.

***

**Shalini Singh Nagpal, J. (Oral)**

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.85 dated 24.03.2026 under Sections 21(b) and 27A of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, Police Station Kalan Wali, Dabwali, Sirsa. This is the first petition for anticipatory bail.

2. It is alleged that on 24.03.2026, complainant-ASI Dilawar Singh was going towards Village Gadrana on patrol duty, when one motorcycle rider came from the front. On seeing the police vehicle, the motorcycle rider started to flee towards the fields. The police party chased him and he was stopped, upon which 20 g 220 mg of *heroin* was recovered from him.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that recovery of contraband was made from co-accused-Gurpreet Singh s/o Avtar Singh. The quantity allegedly recovered was intermediate. No disclosure statement was made by co-accused, Gurpreet Singh upon arrest and disclosure statement (Annexure P-4) was recorded later on, in the Police Station, wherein name of the petitioner figured for the first time as supplier of the contraband. He further submits that there was no money trail, no *Whatsapp* trail and no location trail. Petitioner was falsely implicated just to connect the missing link. He was ready

HARPREET SINGH CHAUHAN
2026.09.11 12:04
I agree to specified portions of
this document

and willing to join investigation. Therefore, he deserved to be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. He, on instructions from SI Ram Swaroop, opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail on the ground that petitioner was involved in 07 other FIRs, 03 of which were registered under the NDPS Act, 1985. His custodial interrogation was required to trace out the source of contraband and others involved in the offence.

6. The benefit of anticipatory bail cannot be granted as a matter of course or routine. While considering the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court is required to balance the right of the prosecution for free, fair and unhindered investigation as also personal liberty of the accused and interest of the society. Role attributed to the accused is required to be considered with great care and caution. Anticipatory bail being an extra-ordinary remedy is to be granted only in exceptional circumstances, where the Court is prima facie of the view that the accused has been falsely involved in the crime.

7. Given the nature and substance of allegations against the petitioner and his prior involvement in 03 other NDPS cases, grant of anticipatory bail, at this stage, would not advance the interest of justice and would rather thwart the statutory investigational powers of the police which is not permissible. Considering all relevant facts and circumstances of the case, but without commenting on the merits, the petition for anticipatory bail is dismissed.

8. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

**(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)**
**JUDGE**

**10.09.2026**
***HS.CHAUHAN***

*Whether Speaking/Reasoned :* *Yes/No*
*Whether Reportable :* *Yes/No*

HARPREET SINGH CHAUHAN
2026.09.11 12:04
I agree to specified portions of
this document