



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

2026:PHHC:076404



209

CRM-M-26389-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision:14.05.2026

Manjot Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Vivek K. Thakur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No.122, dated 20.05.2025, registered under Sections 21-C and 27-A of the NDPS Act (offences punishable under Sections 21-B, 25 and 29 of the NDPS Act and Section 25(1B)(a) of the Arms Act were added lateron), at Police Station Division No.8, District Police Commissionerate Jalandhar.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the allegations that on 20.05.2025, accused Shivam Sodhi @ Shiva was apprehended by a police party on the basis of suspicion and 05 kgs of heroin and drug money to the tune of Rs.22,000/- was recovered from his conscious possession. He was



formally arrested. On interrogation, he suffered a disclosure statement to the effect that the recovered contraband was purchased by him from the present petitioner and one Barinder Singh @ Babbu and that he also used to purchase contraband from Karandeep Singh and Sukhjeet Singh @ Sukha @ Yousaf. The petitioner along with the above named persons was nominated as additional accused. Offence under Section 29 of the NDPS Act was added. Accused Barinder Singh @ Babbu was arrested on 23.05.2025. In pursuance of his disclosure statement, 01 kg of heroin, one Creta make car, 02 pistols of .32 bore and six live cartridges were recovered. The investigation revealed that the Creta car recovered from him was provided by co-accused Pawandeep Kaur and she was nominated as additional accused. Accused Shivam Sodhi @ Shiva also got recovered 07 kgs of heroin and 02 Creta cars subsequently in pursuance of his second disclosure statement. Accused Sukhjeet Singh @ Sukha @ Yousaf was arrested on 23.06.2025 and he too got recovered 100 grams of heroin, 03 pistols of .32 bore and 06 live cartridges. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail, which was dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar vide order dated 04.05.2026.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He was in custody at the time of registration of FIR of this case. Co-accused Pawandeep Kaur has already been extended benefit of anticipatory bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. No recovery is to be



effected from him. His custodial interrogation is not required. He is ready to join the investigation. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel while relying upon the status report has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are quite serious in nature. Co-accused Shivam Sodhi @ Shiva from whom 12 kgs of heroin had been recovered specifically took his name as supplier of 01 kg of contraband to him. For the purpose of eliciting information as to the trail from where the petitioner had procured the contraband as well as for conducting thorough and proper investigation into the matter, his custodial interrogation is required. The investigation is at its nascent stage. Even otherwise, no extraordinary or exceptional circumstance to exercise powers for grant of pre-arrest bail in favour of the petitioner, is made out. It is, therefore, stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

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

6. The petitioner is alleged to have supplied 01 kgs of heroin to co-accused Shivam Sodhi @ Shiva from whom recovery of total 12 kgs of contraband was effected. He has been nominated on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. However, he is involved in one more case of similar nature and another under Sections 302, 148, 149 of IPC read with Section 25 of the Arms Act. The allegations make out a *prima facie* case for commission of subject offences as against the petitioner. For the purpose of recovery of money and for conducting deeper and thorough probe into the matter, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. It is well settled



proposition of law that powers for grant of anticipatory bail should be exercised in exceptional and extraordinary circumstances and not in routine manner. No such circumstance, however, has been made out in this case. If the petitioner is given the shield of anticipatory bail that shall leave many glaring loopholes and gaps, thereby adversely affecting the investigation. The Court is also required to see that an order of anticipatory bail does not operate as inroad in the normal legal procedure of criminal cases by the trial Court. Accordingly, finding no compelling ground to allow the petition, the same is dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

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

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

14.05.2026

harjeet

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