

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

SR. No.101

CRM-M-8210-2022

Date of Decision:25.02.2022

Naresh Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANT PARKASH

Present: Mr. Avtar Singh Bhatti, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanvir Joshi, AAG, Punjab.

[The aforesaid presence is being recorded through video conferencing since the proceedings are being conducted in virtual court.]

SANT PARKASH, J.

Prayer in the present petition is for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0022 dated 10.02.2022 registered under Sections 21/22/29 of the NDPS Act at Police Station Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur.

Allegations against the present petitioner are that on 10.2.2022, the police had apprehended the co-accused Vikas Singh and Shivani and during the personal search of Vikas Singh, 25 intoxicant injections and 100 grams heroin were recovered. Further, 25 intoxicant injections were recovered from co-accused Shivani. A sum of Rs.3,27,000/- was also recovered from the dicky of their scooter. As per the disclosure statement of the co-accused Vikas Singh, which is to the effect that he had purchased the above-said intoxicant injections and heroin from the present petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner

has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the alleged recovery of narcotic substance has been recovered from co-accused and nothing has been recovered from the petitioner. Thus, he prays for acceptance of the present petition.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the present petition on the ground that the present petitioner has sold 25 intoxicant injections (without label) and 100 gram heroin to co-accused Vikas Singh. When the said Vikas Singh was arrested, he made his disclosure statement in which he has admitted these facts. He also submits that except the present case, there are eight more cases registered against the present petitioner under the NDPS Act. It is, thus, prayed that the present petition may be dismissed.

After having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case coupled with the fact that the petitioner is involved in 8 more cases under the NDPS Act, no case is made out to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Consequently, the present petition stands dismissed.

25.02.2022
mks

(SANT PARKASH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES / NO

Whether Reportable: YES / NO