

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

CRM No. M-32421 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 23.09.2016.

Lovish Kumar Grover @ Lovi

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. Raj Kumar Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Angrej Singh.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

By filing this petition, under Section 438 Cr.P.C, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.114 dated 09.10.2015 registered under Sections 27-A and 27-C of Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 at Police Station Division No.8, Kailash Chownk, Ludhiana.

On 22.09.2016, the learned counsel for the petitioner had made a categoric statement that the petitioner was never a tenant at the premises from where allegedly the spurious drugs have been recovered. The petitioner and the person who had allegedly taken the premises in question on rent, namely, Navish Arora @ Navi son of Rajesh Kumar are not one and the same person.

Whereas, the learned State counsel has filed short affidavit of ACP (West) Ludhiana to contend that the identity of petitioner as Navish Arora @ Navi son of Rajesh Kumar is fully established on the basis of statement of owner of the premises, the

persons operating in the neighbourhood and the father of the petitioner who has stated that his son Lovish Kumar Grover is also known as Navish @ Navi. It has further come on record that for the purpose of identification of the petitioner, all the persons were shown the photograph of the petitioner.

It is to be noticed that the petitioner is involved in two more FIRs i.e. FIR No.178 dated 08.10.2015 and FIR No.158 dated 20.08.2016 wherein either the particulars of the petitioner, identity and the address of the petitioner are shown to be different.

From the above, it is prima-facie demonstrated that the petitioner, Lovish Kumar Grover @ Lovi and Navish Arora @ Navi is one and the same person. It appears that the petitioner has succeeded in misleading the Police and made an attempt to thwart the majesty of justice. Thus, the petitioner has not approached this Court with clean hands and accordingly, the present petition is dismissed. In the circumstances, the petitioner be arrested and thorough probe into the above role allegedly played by him and a detailed report be submitted on 07.10.2016.

The Court has proposed to take a decision as regards imposition of exemplary costs on receipt of the above report by the IO.

23.09.2016.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No