

201

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

**CRM-M-15691-2020 (O&M)
Date of decision-18.08.2020**

Sanjay Kumar**...Petitioner****Vs.****State of Haryana and another****...Respondents****CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ****Present:** Mr. Gurjot Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana.

*********MANOJ BAJAJ, J.**

This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 438 Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 56 dated 14.02.2020 under Section 21 Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Dabwali Sadar District Sirsa, Haryana. The petitioner apprehended his arrest at the hands of Police in the above FIR.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that pursuant to the order dated 18.06.2020, the petitioner has joined the investigation. According to him, the recovered contraband was found in possession of co-accused Raj Kamal and on his statement, the petitioner was indicted as a co-accused. He prays for grant of anticipatory bail, as his custodial interrogation may not be necessary.

Learned State counsel assisted by ASI Shailender Kumar has referred to the reply filed by way of affidavit of Kuldeep Beniwal, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of police Dabwali District Sirsa, and opposed the prayer on the ground that recently again the petitioner has committed a similar crime whereupon case FIR No.59 dated 13.03.2020 under Section

21-B NDPS Act, 1985, stands registered against him at Police Station Sadar, Hansi, as 209 grams heroin was found in his possession. He has further apprised the Court that another case FIR No.339/2014 under Sections 323, 324 and 447 IPC registered at Police Station Tibbi, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan is also pending against the petitioner. According to the learned State counsel, the custodial interrogation of petitioner is necessary.

Considering the above background and the fact that during the pendency of investigation in the present case, the petitioner has allegedly committed a similar offence, therefore, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for extending the concession of pre-arrest bail to him. Needless to say that, this order shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

Petition is dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

18.08.2020
vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No