



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

**CRM-M-13532-2026 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 10.04.2026**

JAGMOHAN SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

**UNION OF INDIA, DISTRICT THROUGH NCB,
CHANDIGARH ZONE**

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present: Mr. Navneet Kumar, Advocate (through hybrid mode)
for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Sullar, Advocate and
Mr. Haneesh Kumar, Advocate
for the respondent-NCB.

MANDEEP PANNU, J (ORAL)

1. The present petition is the first petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 19 dated 15.09.2025, registered under Section 8, 21, 25, 29 and 60 of the NDPS Act, registered at NCB Chandigarh Zone.
2. According to the prosecution, Gursahib Singh, Harry, Nikhil, Gurpreet Singh, Gagandeep Singh, Lovepreet Singh, Simranjeet Singh, and Arun @ Salman were operating an organized drug cartel. On 15.09.2025, acting on specific intelligence, the NCB conducted a raid at Hotel SC King, Mohali, where accused Gurpreet Singh and Gagandeep Singh were found staying together in Room No. 202. During the search, 100 grams of heroin was recovered from their conscious possession, leading to their arrest.



During the course of investigation, both accused made disclosure statements. Pursuant thereto, on 19.09.2025, the NCB team intercepted a major consignment near Global Institute, Village Sohian Khurd, Amritsar, resulting in the recovery of 2.188 kg of heroin, which falls within commercial quantity. Further investigation, including the statements of co-accused Harry, Lovejit Singh, Gursahib Singh, and others, revealed the existence of a large and well-organized drug network operating between Amritsar and Mohali. The recoveries effected were not isolated incidents but indicative of a broader drug syndicate. Insofar as the present petitioner is concerned, it has been alleged that he was also involved in drug trafficking and has been specifically named in the disclosure statements of co-accused Gursahib Singh and Lovejit Singh. Accordingly, Section 29 of the NDPS Act has been invoked against him.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused in the instant FIR only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. It is further submitted that the main accused are not known to the petitioner and there is no material on record to establish any acquaintance with them. It is also contended that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and to fully cooperate with the investigating officer concerned.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail by submitting that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. It is contended that recovery of commercial quantity of contraband has been effected from the main accused and during the course of investigation, the



petitioner has been nominated as an accused. He further contends that analysis of the Call Detail Records (CDRs) of Jagmohan, Lovejeet Singh, and Arun reveals that their locations coincided at Zirakpur on 25.03.2025 and again on 29.03.2025 at Zirakpur and Derra Bassi. It is further submitted that between 29.03.2025 and 07.04.2025, eight calls were exchanged between Lovejeet Singh and Arun, who, in their voluntary statements, admitted meeting during this period for delivery of heroin. On these grounds, he seeks dismissal of the instant petition.

5. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and has given thoughtful consideration to the rival submissions. It is not in dispute that the present case pertains to recovery of commercial quantity of contraband, thereby attracting the rigours of Section 37 of the NDPS Act. The contraband was recovered from the main accused, and during interrogation, the petitioner was nominated as an accused in the present FIR on the allegation of his involvement in drug trafficking. During the course of investigation, the police have also collected material evidence in the form of call detail records, which *prima facie* indicate a nexus between the petitioner and the co-accused.

6. Considering the gravity of the offence, the nature of allegations, the commercial quantity involved, and the material collected during investigation connecting the petitioner with the alleged offence, this Court is of the considered opinion that no ground for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

7. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed.

8. However, it is made clear that nothing stated hereinabove shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.



9. All pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

10.04.2026

Poonam Negi

**(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No