

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No.M-32395 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: October 20, 2015

Manpreet Singh @ Manti

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.K.D.S.Sodhi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Simsi Dhir Malhotra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.55 dated 28.06.2015 under Sections 489-A, 489-B, 489-C IPC, Section 25 of the Arms Act, Section 18, 20, 21, 22 of NDPS Act, Section 14 of the Foreigners Act, Section 3 of Official Secrets Act and Sections 3, 20 and 34 of Passport Act registered at Police Station Majitha, District Amritsar.

Notice of motion was issued and learned State counsel appeared and contested the petition.

Police record is also available.

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

From the record, I find that the FIR has been registered on the basis of secret information. The present petitioner is named in the FIR along with other co-accused. The allegations as per the FIR are serious against the accused including the present petitioner that they are involved in supplying of heroine, smack, husk, drugs powder etc. and have connections with the smugglers and they are doing the smuggling of counterfeit currency by crossing the border of Pakistan illegally and also have illegal weapons and also providing secret information and documents to the agencies of their concerned foreigners.

At the time of arguments, learned State counsel argued that accused-petitioner has been nominated by the co-accused.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and after going through the record, I find that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of offence, I do not find it a fit case where petitioner is entitled to benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

October 20, 2015
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE