

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

102

CRM-M-21101-2020

Date of Decision: 30.07.2020

Paramjeet Singh @ Pamma

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

Present: Mr. Satnam Singh Gill, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chinna, AAG, Haryana.

HARI PAL VERMA, J.(Oral)

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.144 dated 10.07.2020 under Sections 18/29 of NDPS Act 1985, registered at Police Station Cheeka, District Kaithal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is innocent and no recovery was effected from him. The recovery, if any, is effected from the co-accused Jasbir Singh, who has named the petitioner. The statement of the co-accused that he purchased the contraband from the petitioner cannot be a ground to decline him bail, as the statement of the co-accused is not admissible in law.

Learned State Counsel has submitted that the petitioner is involved in the business of drug peddling and one more case is registered against him under the NDPS Act. He is a threat to the society being

habitual offender and therefore, petitioner is not entitled for bail.

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The allegations against the petitioner are that he has sold the contraband i.e. opium weighing 1 kg 20 grams to co-accused Jasbir Singh for a sum of Rs.1,50,000/-. When the police conducted the raid, recovery of Rs.50,000/- was effected from the possession of the petitioner. There are allegations that during the raid, the petitioner along with other family members attacked the police raiding-party and fled away after attacking them. Resultantly, another FIR No.465 dated 11.07.2020 under Sections 148, 149, 186, 332, 353, 506 IPC, Police Station Sadar, Karnal, was registered against the petitioner and his family members. Moreover, one more FIR is registered against the petitioner under the NDPS Act.

In the light of aforesaid facts, this Court finds that the petitioner is not entitled for grant of anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

July 30, 2020
seema

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No