

CRM-M-16475 of 2020

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

CRM-M-16475 of 2020
Date of Decision: 25.06.2020

Rakesh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present:- Mr. Vansh Malhotra, Advocate, for the petitioner.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)

The case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. prayer has been made for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioner – Rakesh – in case FIR No.102 dated 08.03.2020 registered under Section 22(c) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 at Police Station City Tohana, District Fatehabad.

According to the prosecution, on 08.03.2020 police party apprehended co-accused Rinku with 130 strips (1300 tablets) of Alprazolam weighing 153 grams and 100 strips (1000 tablets) of Tramadol Hydrochloride weighing 406 grams. During interrogation, he disclosed that he had purchased 100 strips each of Tramadol tablets and Alprazolam tablets from co-accused Surender @ Chhinda, 20 strips of Alprazolam tablets from co-accused Vikram @ Vicky and 10 strips of Alprazolam

CRM-M-16475 of 2020

tablets from the petitioner for a sum of 40/- per strip on 08.03.2020. Thereafter, co-accused Vikram @ Vicky was arrested on 11.03.2020. He in his disclosure statement disclosed that he had purchased 20 strips (200 tablets) of Alprazolam tablets from the petitioner he had further sold the same to co-accused Rinku. Third co-accused Surender @ Chhinda was also arrested on 09.06.2020, who also suffered disclosure statement that he had supplied 30 strips of Alprazolam tablets to the petitioner on 08.03.2020.

Learned counsel *inter alia* contends that on the alleged date of occurrence, police party raided the mobile shop of the petitioner and nothing objectionable was found. Petitioner was taken to the police station and was freed in the evening when no evidence was found against him. However, now with some *mala fide* intention police wants to arrest the petitioner.

Heard.

Considering seriousness of allegations, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. His custodial interrogation is very much necessary.

Dismissed.

June 25, 2020
R.S.

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No