

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

**C.R.M-M No.36614 of 2014
Date of Decision : 26.02.2015**

Amrik Kaur @ Amriko

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. R.K. Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Amarjit Kaur Khurana, Addl.A.G., Punjab.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

This is a petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.111 dated 28.05.2014 registered under Sections 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 27, 29, 61, 85 of the NDPS Act, Section 61 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 and Sections 27, 54 & 59 of the Arms Act at P.S. Sadar Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.

A perusal of the FIR reveals that omnibus allegations have been levelled against different persons belonging to different villages and it has been alleged that these persons are involved in all kinds of illegal activities including smuggling of narcotics, gold, foreign currency and trafficking of

human beings etc. In the FIR, it has also been mentioned that if raid is conducted heavy recovery can be made. However, despite raid having been conducted no recovery has been made.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that these kinds of omnibus and vague allegations can be levelled against any person and considering the seriousness thereof, it is expected that the Courts would be more vigilant and protect people against this arbitrary exercise of police power. As per the learned counsel, had it been a case where any recovery was shown to have been effected it would have been different but no recovery is shown to have been made despite raid having been conducted.

Learned Additional Advocate General on instructions from ASI Kamaljit Singh has accepted the factual assertion that on the receipt of secret information raids were conducted but no recovery could be effected. She has however stated that the petitioner has a criminal record and is involved in one other case i.e. under the Excise Act. She has further argued that though no recovery was made, the secret information cannot be belied.

In my considered opinion, this argument would not suffice because this would be handing absolute powers in the hands of the Police because any person can be indicted, arrested and charged without there being any objective evidence against him. Which is not to say that the petitioner is innocent, but at this stage the issue before the Court is whether she should be subjected to arrest only on the basis of a secret information. In the circumstances, it is the duty of this Court to lean towards the liberty of the citizen whatever his antecedents may be. Consequently, I do not deem it appropriate to deny anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Resultantly, the petition is allowed. In the event of arrest of the petitioner, she shall be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

The petitioner is directed to appear before the investigating officer on 10-03-2015 and on any other date as and when her presence is required. In case the petitioner does not appear before the investigating officer in the aforesaid manner the present petition would be deemed to have been dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending criminal miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

February 26, 2015

ashish

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**