

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

CRM-M-4568-2020

Date of Decision:-20.5.2020

VIKRAMJIT SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Pardeep Kumar Kapila, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Vermani, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

(the aforesaid presence is being recorded through video conferencing since the proceedings are being conducted in Virtual Court)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in a case registered against him vide FIR No.12 dated 12.1.2020 under Sections 22/29 of NDPS Act at Police Station Samana, District Patiala.
2. The case of the prosecution is that a secret information was received by the police to the effect that Sandeep Singh and Amrit indulge in sale of intoxicants and that the petitioner-Vikramjit Singh is coming in his car bearing registration No.PB-11CS-4128 for supplying of intoxicant tablets. Pursuant to the said information Sandeep and Amrit were caught by the police along with their vehicle bearing registration No.HR-26-AB-9552 and 19,000 tablets of Tramadol were recovered from them. It is further

the case of prosecution that upon interrogation the aforesaid Sandeep and Amrit disclosed that Vikramjit Singh had left in his car a few minutes ago. It is further the case of prosecution that when the police went out to look for aforesaid Vikramjit Singh, his car bearing No.PB-11-CS-4128 was found and 2,500 tablets of Tramadol were recovered from the same.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been involved in the present case and he was never arrested at the spot.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that since there was specific information against the petitioner and since the car from which 2,500 tablets had been recovered stands registered in the name of the petitioner, therefore, the complicity of the petitioner is evident.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court. No doubt it is the case of prosecution that 2,500 tablets were recovered from the car belonging to the petitioner, but it is not disputed that the petitioner was never arrested at the spot despite the fact that police had prior information. Further the fact that the car of the petitioner was found to be open is rather questionable. Although the learned State counsel has tried to explain that the petitioner was near the car due to which the car was open, but then it remains unexplained as to why police could not nab the petitioner. It is however informed that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.
6. Having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the petition is accepted and it is ordered that the petitioner, in the event of his arrest

shall be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Arresting/Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

20.5.2020
Gaurav Sorot

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned / speaking? Yes / No

Whether reportable? Yes / No