



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

212

CRM-M-16588-2026
Decided on : 22.04.2026

Deepak alias Deepu

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Kartar Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Deepak @ Deepu, aged 24 years	294	16.12.2025	21(b) of NDPS Act, 1985 [S. 27-A of NDPS Act, added later on]	City Ratia	Fatehabad

2. At the outset, learned State counsel has filed status report dated 08.04.2026, in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

3. In the present case, on 25.03.2026, following order was passed:-

“ *Petitioner, an accused in case FIR No.294 dated 16.12.2025, registered against him for the commission of offences*



punishable u/s 21(b) of NDPS Act (Section 27-A of NDPS Act added later on) at Police Station city Ratia, District Fatehabad, has filed the present petition for grant of anticipatory bail u/s 482 BNS.

Notice of motion.

At this stage, Ms. Shweta Nahata, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and prays for time to file status report in the matter.

Adjourned to 10.04.2026.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends petitioner herein has been falsely implicated in the case in hand as 7.43 grams of heroin was recovered from the possession of co-accused – Lovepreet Singh @ Lovely. Name of the petitioner has surfaced in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of the said accused, which is not admissible in evidence as per law. Besides, disclosure statement, there is no other material available with the investigating agency to connect the petitioner with the crime in question.

Further submits that petitioner is ready to join investigation and to cooperate in the investigation, if protected from arrest. Thus, prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that the petitioner has been specifically named during the course of investigation. It is also contended that in the disclosure statement, petitioner has been assigned the role of supplier of contraband, and thus, his custodial interrogation is very much necessary to nab the other persons involved in the illegal drug trade.

It is also contended that in case the petitioner is granted the concession of anticipatory bail at this stage, it may adversely affect the



investigation and there is every likelihood of his influencing witnesses or tampering with prosecution evidence. Accordingly, prayer has been made for dismissal of the present petition.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the paper-book as well as the status report filed by learned State counsel.

7. This Court notices that the name of the petitioner does not figure in the initial version of the FIR and came to be introduced in the disclosure statement suffered by main accused – Lovepreet Singh @ Lovely.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of allegations, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the controversy, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

8. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during



trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

9. With the directions issued here above, **present petition stands disposed of.**

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 22, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*