

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

CRM-M-30982-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 20.07.2022

Kunta Devi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Arun Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through the instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.252 dated 09.05.2022, registered under Sections 20(b)(ii)(B), 27-A, 29 of the NDPS Act, at Police Station City Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that the petitioner was not named in the present case, but was indicted on the disclosure statement of co-accused Biro; that the alleged recovery of 11 kg. 'Ganja' each has already been effected from co-accused Biro and Tarun, who were apprehended from the spot; that as per the statement of co-accused Biro, the petitioner has given an amount of Rs. 21,000/- to Biro for purchasing 03 Kg. of 'Ganja'; that the petitioner has nothing to do with the present case and that even no recovery has been effected from her.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and have also gone through the paper-book.

In the present case, the allegation against the petitioner is that she has given an amount of Rs. 21,000/- to co-accused Biro for purchasing of 3 kg. of 'Ganja'. The petitioner is a habitual offender, as she is also involved in three other cases under NDPS Act.

Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is a habitual and is involved in three other similar cases, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to unearth the whole nexus of drug peddlers. Therefore, this Court is of the view that she does not deserve concession of the anticipatory bail.

The present petition is dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

20.07.2022

Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No