

was not apprehended from the spot and he was named in the disclosure statement, he is not involved in any other case under the Act.

Learned State Counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail and submits that a deeper probe is required to know the supply chain of the intoxicants. He further submits that heavy recovery was made from the co-accused.

The observation made hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding anticipatory bail and shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

The recovery from the co-accused was of 53100 tablets of Tramadol. The veracity and evidentiary value of the disclosure statement would be a subject matter of the trial. The case set up is not only that recovered contra band were supplied by the petitioner but he had kept rest of the intoxicants tablets with him. To unearth the *modus operandi* a deeper probe is required which would not be possible if petitioner is granted protection of pre-arrest bail. No case is made out for grant of anticipatory bail.

Petition is dismissed.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

12th May, 2022
anuradha

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