

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

**CRM-1082-2021 IN/AND  
CRM-M-41195-2020  
Date of decision:19.01.2021**

Jaspal Singh @ Shera @ Gaggu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. Ashok Giri, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Randhir Singh Thind, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)**

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

**CRM-1082-2021**

Application is allowed as prayed for.

Annexure P-7 is taken on record.

**CRM-M-41195-2020**

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.156 dated 18.07.2019, registered at Police Station Goraya, District Jalandhar Rural, under Sections 21, 22 and Section 29 (added subsequently) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Sukhjinder Singh (Driver), Lovejeet Singh, sitting by his side and Rajbir Singh, who was sitting on the back seat of a car, bearing registration No. PB-02-BS-7056, were apprehended along with contraband/intoxicant tablets/

injections, which falls within the ambit of non-commercial quantity. Co-accused, namely, Sukhjinder Singh (Driver) and Rajbir Singh, were granted bail by the trial Court. It is further stated that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and rather he along with other four accused persons stands indicted on a disclosure statement of the co-accused. Out of four co-accused, two have been granted anticipatory bail, but anticipatory bail of the petitioner has been declined.

Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, points out that there are two other cases registered against the petitioner under the NDPS Act and the recovery allegedly effected in those cases falls under non-commercial quantity and he has already been enlarged on bail in the said cases.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Admittedly, the petitioner is involved in two other cases under the NDPS Act other than the present case. This fact clearly shows his criminal antecedents and if enlarged on bail, there are chances that he may again commit such offences. Thus, he is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

No case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out.

Dismissed.

**19.01.2021**

ishwar

**(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking? Yes/No  
Whether reportable? Yes/No