

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No. M-19897 of 2015

Date of decision : July 02, 2015

Pammi

... Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Mr. Amritpal Singh Gill, AAG, Punjab.

SURINDER GUPTA, J

Heard.

As per allegations in the FIR No.31 dated 8.5.2015, DSP Nahar Singh posted at Sangrur received a secret information that petitioner along with two other ladies namely Banso and Chachi, indulge in sale of charas and other narcotics. They bring charas and other narcotics from Haryana and sell the same at higher rate in Punjab. About 20-25 days prior to the receipt of secret information, they were apprehended by HC Gurlal Singh, HC Charanjit Singh, HC Raja Singh and Home Guard Harjinder Singh and charas was recovered from their possession but they settled the matter with them and got themselves released after paying ₹30,000/-. The booty of ₹30,000/- received by the police official was distributed amongst themselves. The inspector further apprised Deputy Superintendent of Police that the aforesaid police officials were planning to go from Sangrur to Samundgarh, Chhanna and Bagria in Alto car bearing registration No.PB-11-N-0049 to sell the charas they have received/recovered from the petitioner and other ladies and if a *naka* be held in the area of village Balia at the bridge of drain, they can be apprehended. The police held *naka*, apprehended the police officials and recovered 1.8 kg of charas from their possession.

Learned State counsel submits that during interrogation, they have disclosed to the police that out of 4 kg of charas recovered from the petitioner and her associates, they returned 2 kg of charas to them in lieu of payment of ₹30,000/-. The statement of aforesaid police officials to this effect has been recorded and charas in possession of the petitioner and other ladies mentioned in the FIR is yet to be recovered, for which their custodial interrogation is required.

Learned counsel for petitioner submits that at this stage there is only secret information against the petitioner. She has no adverse record or was involved in any such case.

Keeping in view the above facts and that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to ascertain the facts that have come in the investigation of the case and the investigation is to be made regarding allegations of payment of bribe to police officials to take undue benefit of release from custody, no ground is made out to extend benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

This petition has no merits.

Dismissed.

July 02, 2015
deepak

(Surinder Gupta)
Judge