

201

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

CRM-M-40660 of 2015

Date of decision: December 09, 2015

Gurdev Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. D.N. Ganeriwala, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. R.P.S. Sidhu, AAG Punjab.

SABINA, J

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.159 dated 24.07.2015, under Section 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substance Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Kotwali, District Faridkot.

Prosecution story, in brief, is that Pargat Singh son of the petitioner was undergoing sentence in a case relating to recovery of popy husk and was confined in Central Jail, Faridkot. Pargat Singh while in jail started supplying drugs to the inmates of the Jail and money was deposited in the account of the petitioner. It is further the case of the prosecution that the money deposited in the account of the petitioner was withdrawn by his co-accused Assistant Superintendent, Jail with the help of Automated Teller Machine (ATM) card.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely involved in this case. Petitioner has no concern with the amount allegedly deposited in his account or withdrawn from his account.

Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has opposed the petition and has submitted that ₹5,51,725/- were deposited in the account of the petitioner by various persons and the same was withdrawn by his co-accused with the help of ATM card. Petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

In the present case, allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. During enquiry, it transpired that various persons had deposited money in the account of the petitioner and in all, ₹5,51,725/- were deposited in the account of the petitioner. Son of the petitioner was lodged in Central Jail, Faridkot, where, he started dealing in sale of drugs and the money was deposited in the account of the petitioner. Petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

Keeping in view the seriousness of allegations levelled against the petitioner, no ground for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, is made out.

Dismissed.

(SABINA)
JUDGE

December 09, 2015
mahavir