

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-22542-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-28.6.2021

Vikas Bansal

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Brijeshwar Singh Bhalla, Advocate for the petitioner.

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

1. This is the second petition filed on behalf of the petitioner seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.289 dated 14.10.2020 registered at Police Station Division No.8, District Jalandhar under Section 22 of NDPS Act, wherein the allegations against the petitioner are to the effect that he had stored a huge quantity of drugs in Ludhiana without there being any license or authorisation in respect of the same.
2. The earlier petition filed on behalf of the petitioner seeking anticipatory bail was dismissed vide detailed order dated 22.2.2021 (Annexure P-8). The petitioner thereafter challenged the said order dated 22.2.2021 by way of filing Special Leave Petition (SLP) in Hon'ble the Supreme Court but the

same was also dismissed vide order dated 15.3.2021 (Annexure P-9), which reads as follows:

“We see no reason to interfere with the order rejecting application seeking anticipatory bail.

However, it is made clear that on the issue of arrest, the matter shall be considered purely on its own merits and the arrest shall be effected only if the custodial interrogation is found necessary by the investigating machinery.

The Special Leave Petition is dismissed.”

3. Thereafter the petitioner moved another application seeking anticipatory bail before the Trial Court which was also dismissed vide order dated 20.4.2021 (Annexure P-10) holding therein that custodial interrogation was required.
4. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and have also perused the earlier order as well as the order passed by Hon’ble the Supreme Court and also the order passed by the Trial Court on the second anticipatory bail application.
5. This Court does not find any ground for grant of anticipatory bail keeping in view the factual matrix and is of the opinion that it is certainly a case where custodial interrogation is warranted. Even otherwise this being a second anticipatory bail petition and there being no change of any circumstance, there will be no justification for grant of anticipatory bail in the second anticipatory bail application. The petition is sans merit and is hereby dismissed.

28.6.2021

pankaj

Whether speaking /reasoned

Whether Reportable

Yes / No

Yes / No

**(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge**