

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.17731 of 2021

Date of Decision: 17th February, 2022.

Gurnam Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present: Mr. Vikas Bishnoi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ambika Sood, Additional Advocate
General, Haryana.

* * * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.

Apprehending his arrest in the criminal case pertaining to the FIR bearing No.77 dated 08.02.2021 registered at Police Station Sadar Hisar, under Section 21-B of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (here-in-after referred to as 'the Act') wherein the offence under Section 27-A of the Act is stated to have been added later-on, the petitioner has preferred this petition for seeking the relief of anticipatory bail.

Shorn and short of unnecessary details, the allegations, as levelled against the petitioner in this case, are that on 08.02.2021, the co-accused of the petitioner named Sukhdev @ Bittu was apprehended by the police party and 07 (seven) gms *heroin* was recovered from him. In his disclosure statement, he nominated the petitioner as the person from whom he had purchased the said contraband for a sum of Rs.9000/-.

Status-report has already been filed on behalf of the respondent-State, by way of the affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Hisar-2.

Heard.

It is pertinent to mention here that vide the order dated 28.04.2021 passed by the Co-ordinate Bench, the petitioner was granted the relief of interim bail with the direction to join in the investigation. However, in Para No.6 of the Status-report, it has specifically been deposed that though, the petitioner joined the investigation but he did not co-operate the Investigating Agency and did not disclose the source as well as the *modus operandi* adopted by him, to get the contraband and in Para No.8 therein, it is mentioned that his custodial interrogation is required to elicit the truth in this regard. Moreover, in Para No.7, it has also been categorically mentioned that besides the present case, the petitioner is facing the trial in two more cases under the Act.

Keeping in view the above-discussed facts and circumstances and also the fact that the offence under Section 27-A attracts the rigour of Section 37 of the Act, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the relief of anticipatory bail. Resultantly, the petition in hand stands dismissed accordingly.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

17.02.2022.
seema

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes
Whether Reportable?	No