



102

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

CRM-M No.26833 of 2026

Date of Decision: 13.05.2026

Sundri**..... Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana****....Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.50, dated 24.02.2026, under Section 20(b)(ii)(c) of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, registered at Police Station GRP Ambala Cantt., District Ambala.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the police party while on patrolling on 24.02.2026 received a secret information to the effect that two ladies, namely, Makhni Devi and Anjana Kumari, were involved in dealing of narcotic substance and were sitting on their bags at the Railway Station Ambala Cantt at Platform No.2/4. It was informed that they would be supplying Ganja in the area of Chandigarh and Punjab through train and were having hidden intoxicant substances in their bags and if raid is conducted, they could be apprehended along with the contraband. On receiving the secret information, police reached at the



place as disclosed in the secret information, where, two ladies with similar physical identification as disclosed by the informant, were seen. They were apprehended by the police party. On asking, they disclosed their names to be Makhni Devi and Anjana Kumari. They were suspected to be carrying some contraband in the bags which they were carrying and thus, search was conducted. On conducting the search, 55 kgs 670 grams of *ganja*, were recovered from 04 bags, being carried by them. They failed to produce any licence regarding the possession of the same. Thus, the FIR was registered and they were arrested on the spot. On registration of FIR, the investigation commenced. Samples taken were sent to FSL. During investigation, complicity of the petitioner was surfaced who was found to be purchaser of the contraband, thus, she was also arrayed as an accused. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fast Track Special Court for Trial of Offences Under NDPS Act, Ambala praying for the grant of anticipatory bail. However, after hearing both the sides, finding no merit in the same, the learned trial Court, Ambala dismissed the petition filed by the petitioner vide order dated 07.05.2026. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of anticipatory bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. It is submitted that neither the petitioner was named in the FIR nor any recovery has been effected from her. However, she has been implicated in



the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, namely, Makhni Devi and Anjana Kumari from whom recovery of 55 kgs 670 grams of *Ganja*, were effected. He submits that there is nothing incriminating to connect the petitioner with the alleged recovery. He submits that the disclosure statement of co-accused is not even an admissible evidence. He relied upon the law laid down in a judgment passed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in '***Criminal Appeal No.3640 of 2025 titled as Jugraj Singh Vs. State of Punjab***'. He thus, submits that there being no *prima facie* case made out against the petitioner, he deserves to be granted anticipatory bail.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the submission made by counsel for the petitioner and has submitted that as per the investigation conducted so far, complicity of the petitioner surfaced on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Makhni Devi and Anjana Kumari, from whom recovery of 55 kgs 370 grams of *Ganja* were effected. The alleged recovery effected in the present case is of commercial quantity and thus, provisions of Section 37 of NDPS Act, are attracted. He submits that the recovered contraband was to be supplied to the present petitioner. He submits that *prima facie* complicity of the petitioner has been established. He submits that no case for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out and thus, the present petition being devoid of merit deserves to be dismissed

5. On hearing the counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the complicity of the petitioner has been



found in the present case during investigation on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, namely, Makhni Devi and Anjana Kumari, as the recovered contraband was to be supplied to the present petitioner and on the basis of the same, he was implicated as an accused in the present case. As submitted before this Court, the alleged recovery effected in the present case is of 55 kgs 370 grams of *Ganja*, which falls under the category of huge commercial quantity. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much required in order to unearth the nexus as well as the source and supply chain of the contraband. In all its humility, there is no dispute regarding the judgment relied upon by counsel for the petitioner, however, in the facts and circumstances of the same, the same is distinguishable. Needless to say that the case is under investigation.

6. For the consideration of anticipatory bail, the statutory parameters are given under Section 482 (1) & (2) BNSS which reads as under:-

“Direction for grant of bail to person apprehending arrest:

1. *When any person has reason to believe that he may be arrested on an accusation of having committed a non-bailable offence, he may apply to the High Court or the Court of Session for a direction under this section; and that Court may, if it thinks fit, direct that in the event of such arrest, he shall be released on bail.*
2. *When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-*
 - (i) *a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*



- (ii) *a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
- (iii) *a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;*
- (iv) *such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.”*

7. As per the law settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in ***Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab***, AIR 1980 SC 1632, while granting anticipatory bail, the Court is to maintain a balance between the individual liberty and the interest of society. However, the interest of the society would always prevail upon the right of personal liberty. The relevant part of the judgment is as follows:-

“31. *In regard to anticipatory bail, if the proposed accusation appears to stem not from motives of furthering the ends of justice but from some ulterior motive, the object being to injure and humiliate the applicant by having him arrested, a direction for the release of the applicant on bail in the event of his arrest would generally be made. On the other hand, if it appears likely, considering the antecedents of the applicant, that taking advantage of the order of anticipatory bail he will flee from justice, such an order would not be made. But the converse of these propositions is not necessarily true. That is to say, it cannot be laid down as an inexorable rule that anticipatory bail cannot be granted unless the proposed accusation appears to be actuated by mala fides; and, equally, that anticipatory bail must be granted if there is no fear that the applicant will abscond. There are several other considerations, too*



numerous to enumerate, the combined effect of which must weigh with the court while granting or rejecting anticipatory bail. The nature and seriousness of the proposed charges, the context of the events likely to lead to the making of the charges, a reasonable possibility of the applicant's presence not being secured at the trial, a reasonable apprehension that witnesses will be tampered with and "the larger interests of the public or the state" are some of the considerations which the court has to keep in mind while deciding an application for anticipatory bail. The relevance of these considerations was pointed out in State v. Captain Jagjit Singh (1962) 3 SCR 622, which, though, was a case under the old Section 498 which corresponds to the present Section 439 of the Code. It is of paramount consideration to remember that the freedom of the individual is as necessary for the survival of the society as it is for the egoistic purposes of the individual. A person seeking anticipatory bail is still a free man entitled to the presumption of innocence. He is willing to submit to restraints on his freedom, by the acceptance of conditions which the court may think fit to impose, in consideration of the assurance that if arrested, he shall be enlarged on bail."

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State Vs. Anil Sharma***, (1997) 7SCC 187, held as under:-

“6. We find force in the submission of the CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favorable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful



informations and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third-degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders.”

9. The petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of anticipatory bail, however, Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***The State of Haryana vs. Samarth Kumar, 2022 Livelaw (SC) 622*** has held that in the cases like the present one, the accused may take advantage of facts like no recovery was effected from him and that he was implicated on the basis of disclosure statement made by the main accused, at the time of arguing regular bail application or at the time of final hearing after conclusion of trial.

10. Weighing the facts of the case on the anvil of the law settled, it is apparent that the complicity of the petitioner has been prima facie found. Needless to say, the investigation is at the initial stage and in the facts and circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would



be essential and granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage would scuttle the ongoing investigation.

11. In view of the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner does not qualify for the grant of anticipatory bail and the same is hereby dismissed. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

13.05.2026

ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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