

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

**CRM-M-24111-2022
Date of decision: 31.05.2022**

Nachattar Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Arunjeet Singh Kakkar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 115 dated 16.07.2021, registered under Sections 304 and 34 of the IPC at Police Station Jaitu, District Faridkot.

Though the present petition is stated to be the first petition filed by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail, however, the Registry has raised an objection that in fact this is the second petition as the earlier petition bearing CRM-M-11888-2022, filed by the petitioner, was dismissed on 22.03.2022 along with similar bail application of co-accused Bimla alias Bimla Devi. The operative part of the order reads as under:

“Prayer in these petitions, filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., is for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioners Nachattar Singh and Bimla alias Bimla Devi in FIR No. 115 dated 16.07.2021, registered under Sections 304 and 34 of the IPC at Police Station Jaitu, District Faridkot.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that as per allegations in the FIR, registered at the instance of complainant Manjit Kaur, it is stated that her elder son Ajaypal Singh was a drug addict and she used to restrain

the accused persons i.e. petitioners Nachattar Singh, Bimla alias Bimla Devi and one Banso from selling drugs to her son. It is further stated that on 25.06.2021, the son of the complainant died after consuming narcotic substance, supplied by the petitioners as well as the co-accused.

Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that there is no other case pending against the petitioners.

In reply, learned State counsel submits that one of the co-accused, namely Banso, has already been arrested and *challan* qua her has been presented before the trial Court.

Learned State counsel further submits that there are serious allegations against both the petitioners that they were continuously supplying the narcotic drugs to the son of the complainant, who died after consuming the same.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, considering the fact that there are serious allegations against the petitioners, I find no ground to ground them the concession of anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, both the petitions are dismissed.”

Faced with this, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks withdrawal of the present petition.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

31.05.2022

Waseem Ansari

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No