



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-22244 of 2026

Date of Decision: 14.05.2026

Kuldeep Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Mr. Vipul Jindal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab, for the respondent.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. This petition for anticipatory bail is the first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No. 325 dated 23.12.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s) 21(c) and 29 of 'the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985' and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, Police Station Anti Narcotic Force (ANT), District S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali, Punjab.

2. Vide order dated 23.04.2026, the petitioner was admitted to interim anticipatory bail, subject to the condition of furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. It was also directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation.

3. The learned State Counsel has filed status report, in the Registry. The same be taken on record.

**Criminal Misc. No. M-22244 of 2026**

4. Heard.

5. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that in compliance with order dated 23.04.2026, the petitioner has already joined the investigation, and that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner. In view of above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has requested that the order dated 23.04.2026 be made absolute.

6. The learned State counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. According to the learned State counsel, although the petitioner has joined the investigation, but his custodial interrogation is required to recover the mobile phone and find out the source of payment of money.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. With regard to fact-situation of this case and the above mentioned arguments, following are the relevant factors which are supposed to be taken into consideration:-

- i) that the petitioner has already joined the investigation;
- ii) that as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of 'Vinay Kumar Gupta v. State of Madhya Pradesh' [Criminal Appeal No.939 of 2026, decided on 16.02.2026] the petitioner cannot be forced to assist the prosecuting agency for the recovery of incriminating material, which may harm his interests or may amount to defeating his right of defence
- iii) that as per law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of 'Sanjay Sharma v. State of

**Criminal Misc. No. M-22244 of 2026**

- Haryana' [Criminal Appeal No.767 of 2026, decided on 09.02.2026], collection of evidence is the responsibility of the Investigating Officer, and that an accused cannot be compelled to self-incriminate himself;
- iv) that nothing has been recovered from the possession of petitioner, and therefore, the rigors of Section-37 of the NDPS Act are not attracted in the present case;
 - v) that the only evidence collected by the investigating agency against the petitioner, is the disclosure statement of co-accused of the petitioner, and there is a question mark with regard to credibility & admissibility of above-mentioned statement in evidence, as the same was recorded when the co-accused of the petitioner was in police custody. Since pursuant to above-mentioned disclosure statement recovery of any incriminating material or discovery of fact has not taken place, *prima facie* the above-mentioned statement appears to be hit by Section-23 of Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam;
 - vi) that the investigation and trial of the case are not likely to be concluded in near future;
 - vii) that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to produce a fruitful result;
 - viii) that there is nothing on record to show that while on interim anticipatory bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and

**Criminal Misc. No. M-22244 of 2026**

ix) that there is nothing on record to show that while on interim anticipatory bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the investigation.

9. Keeping in view the aforesaid submissions and the fact that the petitioner has already joined the investigation, it is hereby ordered that the petitioner is entitled to anticipatory bail. Hence, the present petition is hereby **allowed** and the order dated 23.04.2026, whereby the petitioner was accorded the benefit of interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

May 14, 2026
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No