

124

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

CRM-M-26601-2021

Date of Decision: 13.07.2021

Krishna Kaile

Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Narender Hooda, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Sudhir Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Monika Jalota, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The matter is taken up for hearing through video conference due to COVID-19 situation.

This petition is filed for quashing of F.I.R. No. 30/2021, dated 1st March, 2021, under Sections 22(c), 25, 29 and 61 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 [hereinafter 'the Act'] and Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of I.P.C., registered at Police Station Division 4, Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana.

The basic argument raised is that there is no violation of provisions of the Act by the petitioner and there are no allegations that the premises were being misutilized for any illegal activity under the Act. The reliance is placed upon status report filed in anticipatory bail petition filed by petitioner, to submit that that no case is made out against petitioner. Contention is that petitioner is 77 years old lady and no specific role is attributed to her.

Learned State counsel submits that there is recovery of about 43 lakhs tablets of Tramadol.

In response, learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that there is licence for production of Tramadol. Manufacturing was done in accordance with the terms and conditions of the licence. Contention is, in any case no role can be attributed to the petitioner.

At this stage, the Court is informed that matter is under investigation. The version of the petitioner is partially before the Investigating Officer, she has been granted anticipatory bail.

Let petitioner put all the documentary evidence etc., before the investigating agency to show that no case is made out against her.

In view of above, the petition is disposed of with liberty to approach again in case need so arises after completion of investigation.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

13th July, 2021
pankaj baweja

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |