

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

**CRM-M-13589-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 26.10.2017**

James @ Jimma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Ashok Giri, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. A.S. Gill, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

The prayer in this petition is for issuance of a direction to the respondents not to harass the petitioner on the pretext of implicating the petitioner in a case under the NDPS Act.

Reply by way of affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Nakodar, Jalandhar has been filed in Court today and the same is taken on record. As per the reply, the petitioner is already facing trial in six FIRs under the NDPS Act out of which, in one FIR, he has been acquitted, in three FIRs, he has been convicted and in two FIRs, he is facing trial. So far the allegation of harassing the petitioner, it is submitted in the reply as under: -

4. That petitioner is notorious criminal and following FIR's are registered against him:-

a. FIR No. 272 dated 04.12.2011 u/s 15/16/85 NDPS Act PS City Nakodar in which petitioner was acquitted vide order dated 11.12.2014.

b. FIR No. 69 dated 29.3.2013 u/s 21/61/85 NDPS Act PS City Nakodar in which petitioner was convicted vide order dated 14.08.2015.

c. FIR No. 247 dated 29.8.2013 u/s 15/61/85 NDPS Act PS Sadar, Nakodar in which petitioner was convicted vide order dated 23.9.2015.

d. FIR No. 181 dated 20.05.2014 u/s 15/61/85 NDPS Act PS City Nakodar in which petitioner was convicted vide order dated 23.03.2015.

e. FIR No. 386 dated 13.09.2014 u/s 22/61/85 NDPS Act PS City Nakodar which is undergoing trial before Ld Trial Court.

f. FIR No. 61 dated 22.04.2016 u/s 21/61/85 NDPS Act PS City Nakodar which is undergoing trial before Ld Trial Court.

Since it is submitted in the reply that the police has not conducted raid in the house of the petitioner and the wife of the petitioner was never abused by the police authorities, it may noticed that in para 11 of the reply, it is also stated that the police has complied with provisions of Section 160 Cr.P.C., in each and every case and, therefore, the apprehension of the petitioner that he may be involved in some false case is denied in this affidavit.

Accordingly, this petition is rendered as infructuous.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

26.10.2017
Divyanshi

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