

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

328

**CRM-M-17556-2022 (O&M)
Decided on : 25.05.2022**

Munni

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

PRESENT: Mr. K.L. Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rohit Arya, DAG, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

This is the third petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 182, dated 24.09.2020, under Sections 20(C), 27-A of NDPS Act, 1985 and Sections 201 & 420 of IPC, registered at Police Station Narwana City, District Jind (Haryana).

Earlier petition filed by the petitioner seeking concession of bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. was dismissed as withdrawn on 07th December, 2021 (Annexure P-2).

On a pointed query put to the learned counsel as to what was the material change in circumstances subsequent to the withdrawal of the previous petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., he submits that the petitioner has now been in custody since 27th October, 2020. He, however, has not been able to bring to the notice of this Court any other material change in circumstances, which would warrant entertaining the instant petition.

Be that as it may, learned State counsel on instructions has

apprised the Court that the petitioner is a man of criminal antecedents, as he has been involved in three other cases under the NDPS Act. He further submits that the FIR in question was registered against the petitioner while she was on bail in the other three cases pending against her under the NDPS Act.

Learned State counsel submits that no doubt the petitioner has been nominated as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused from whom a huge recovery of 286 grams of smack, was effected (commercial quantity), however, the fact is that she is a supplier of narcotics and other substances. He has thus opposed the prayer of the learned counsel for the grant of concession of bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

In the facts and circumstances of the case as enumerated hereinabove and more so, since learned counsel has failed to bring to the notice of this Court any substantial change in circumstances, subsequent to the withdrawal of the previous petition on 07th December, 2021, the petitioner *prima facie* appears to be involved in the narcotics and drugs trade and hence, this Court does not deem it a fit case to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

May 25, 2022

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No