

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

105

CRM-M-25169-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 02.06.2022

PAWAN KUMAR

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Through the instant petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.100 dated 25.04.2022, registered under Section 21(b) of the NDPS Act, at Police Station Ding, District Sirsa.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that the petitioner was neither arrested at the spot nor any recovery was effected from him and that the petitioner has been indicted on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused, namely, Virender Partap @ Bhunder, from which the alleged recovery was effected.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

As per the order dated 13.05.2022 passed by Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa, there are 24 more cases registered and/or pending against the petitioner out of which, the petitioner stands convicted in six cases, fined in seven and the remaining are under trial. Moreover, the co-accused, in his disclosure statement, has specifically stated that the

contraband recovered in the present case was bought by him from the petitioner. Thus, keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is a habitual offender having criminal antecedents, he does not deserve concession of the anticipatory bail. Moreover, the nature of the offences committed by the petitioner is sufficient enough to hold that if released on bail, he would again involve himself in similar crime.

In view of the above, no ground is made out to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

02.06.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No