

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

(1)

CRM No.M-279 of 2015 (O&M)

Mahinder Partap Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(2)

CRM No.M-1299 of 2015 (O&M)

Ranjit Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(3)

CRM No.M-1963 of 2015 (O&M)

Satnam Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Date of Decision: January 22, 2015

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Ashish Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CRM No.M-279 of 2015 and
CRM No.M-1299 of 2015).

Mr.Amit Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM No.M-1963 of 2015).

Mr.S.S.Chandumajra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

All the above-mentioned three petitions are taken up
together being arisen from same FIR.

Petitioners have filed these petitions under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR no.216 dated 16.11.2014 under Sections 15, 18, 21 and 22 of the NDPS Act and under Section 25 of the Arms Act and under Sections 489-A, 489-B, 489-C IPC registered at Police Station Jhabhal, District Tarn Taran.

Notice of motion in CRM No.M-1963 of 2015.

On the asking of the Court, Mr.S.S.Chandumajra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Notice of motion in connected petitioners have already been issued.

Learned State counsel contested all the petitions.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that the petitioners are named in the FIR which has been recorded on the basis of secret information. In the FIR, there are allegations that petitioners belong to a gang which is involved in the activities of smuggling and supplying different kinds of contrabands and fake currency etc. Learned State counsel has also argued that these petitioners are also involved in other cases.

Against petitioner Ranjit Singh, two FIRs have already been registered as mentioned in the order of learned lower Court. Similarly, against Mahinder Partap Singh, one FIR is already recorded under NDPS Act. As against petitioner Satnam Singh, it is stated in the order of lower Court that already four cases have been registered

under the Excise Act against him.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances, I find that the petitioners are required for custodial interrogation and no case is made out at this stage to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Therefore, finding no merit in all the above-mentioned three petitions, the same are dismissed.

January 22, 2015
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE