

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

209

CRM-M-1871-2021

Date of decision: 17.03.2021

Mukh Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Laghuinder Singh Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Walia, Asstt. AG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J. (ORAL)

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

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, "the Cr.P.C") for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.144 dated 07.08.2018 registered under Sections 22 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short, "the NDPS Act") at Police Station Lehra, District Sangrur.

While issuing notice of motion on 14.01.2021, this Court had granted interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner with direction to join the investigation and the relevant part of the said order reads as under:-

"Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was not named in the FIR, was not arrested on the spot and no recovery was made from him. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case on the basis of disclosure statements made by his co-accused Ravi @ Banti and Santosh Rani from whose possession recovery of 5000 intoxicating tablets was made. The disclosure statement of the co-accused has no evidentiary value. The petitioner has nothing to do with the alleged recovery. Rigors of Section 37(1)(b) of the NDPS are not applicable qua the petitioner. The petitioner is not involved in any

other case under the NDPS Act. The petitioner is ready to join the investigation.

Notice of motion.

Pursuant to supply of advance copy, Mr. Rana Harjasdeep, DAG, Punjab has appeared and accepted notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Learned State Counsel seeks time to file reply.

Adjourned to 17.03.2021.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim anticipatory bail by the arresting officer/investigating officer on furnishing of bail bonds by him to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/investigating officer. The petitioner shall comply with the conditions enumerated under Section 438(2) (i) to (iii) of the Cr.P.C. In view of Section 438(2)(iv) read with Section 437(3)(b) of the Cr.P.C. interim anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner shall also be subject to the condition that he shall not commit any similar offence under the NDPS Act after his release on interim anticipatory bail. In case of non-compliance of the above-said conditions, the petitioner shall not be entitled to the protection of interim anticipatory bail allowed to him."

The petition has been opposed by the learned State Counsel.

However, no reply has been filed by the respondent-State.

I have heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned State Counsel and have gone through the record.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has, while reiterating submissions made earlier, submitted that in compliance with order dated 14.01.2021, the petitioner has joined the investigation and he may be granted anticipatory bail as his custodial interrogation is not required in the case.

On the other hand, learned State Counsel has vehemently opposed the petition and submitted that in view of gravity of accusation, the petitioner does not deserve grant of anticipatory bail. Therefore, the petition may be dismissed.

However, learned State Counsel has, on instructions from ASI Kulwinder Singh, acknowledged that in compliance with order dated 14.01.2021 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation and that his custodial interrogation is not required in the case.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation against the petitioner, the fact that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required in the case and there is no material to justify the apprehension of the petitioner fleeing from justice or tampering with evidence or criminally intimidating the prosecution witnesses, but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the grant of anticipatory bail.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and order dated 14.01.2021 granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation again if and as and when called upon to do so and shall comply with the conditions enumerated under Section 438(2) (i) to (iii) of the Cr.P.C. In view of Section 438(2)(iv) read with Section 437(3)(b) of the Cr.P.C. anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner shall also be subject to the condition that he shall not commit any similar offence under the NDPS Act after his release on anticipatory bail. In case of non-compliance of the above-said conditions, the petitioner shall not be entitled to the protection of anticipatory bail allowed to him.

17.03.2021

Vinay

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

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