

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

101

**CRM-M-29625-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 05.08.2022.**

Bhim Singh

....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Ms. Manpreet Ghuman, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rana Harjasdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

By this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in the context of FIR No.110 dated 26.07.2021, registered at Police Station S.T.F., Phase-4, Mohali, District SAS Nagar (area Moti Nagar), alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under Sections 22 and 22(c) of the NDPS Act (Section 29 of the NDPS Act added lateron).

Learned State counsel today has produced in court a copy of the affidavit filed by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Special Task Force, Ludhiana Range, dated 01.10.2021, in the petition earlier filed by the petitioner, i.e. CRM-M-38070-2021, with that petition having been withdrawn by the petitioner on 10.11.2021, even while the petition filed by his co-accused, i.e. Gaurav Sharma (CRM-M-46308-2021), was allowed on the reasoning given in that order (essentially of course with the interim order having been made absolute upon a statement having been made by the investigating officer that custodial interrogation was not required).

Mr. Rana points out that in the said affidavit dated 01.10.2021, it has been very clearly stated that the call details record of the mobile phone of the petitioner and his co-accused Sushil Kumar were obtained; and it was seen that between 07.04.2021 and 10.07.2021 fourteen telephone calls were made by the petitioner to Sushil Kumar, all calls having been made from Karnal (Haryana). Similarly, seventeen telephone calls were found to be made by Sushil Kumar to the petitioner.

It has also been stated in the affidavit that the petitioner used to send intoxicant drugs to Sushil Kumar through a particular transport company, named in that affidavit.

In view of the above, I see no ground to entertain this petition, which is consequently dismissed.

However, nothing stated herein above would be taken to be an observation of this court on the actual merits of the case but only in the context of a petition seeking that the petitioner be admitted to anticipatory bail.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

05.08.2022

komal

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No

Whether Reportable : Yes/ No