

212

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

CRM-M-40656-2021

Date of Decision: 28.03.2022

Ami Lal

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

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

Mr. Naveen S. Panwar, DAG, Haryana.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)

At the outset, Mr. Naveen S. Panwar, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, has stated on instructions from A.S.I. Maninder Singh, that in pursuance of the order passed by this Court on 26.10.2021, the petitioner has already joined investigation and he is fully cooperating with the investigation process. He on specific instructions has submitted that the petitioner is not required for further custodial interrogation. Learned State counsel further submitted that the subject matter of the present petition pertains to 600 tablets of *Tramadol* recovered from the dicky of a motorcycle of the co-accused, on whose disclosure statement, the petitioner's name was nominated.

Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, learned counsel for the petitioner has stated that there is no other material available with the State to connect the petitioner with the present offence apart from the disclosure statement.

This Court had granted interim protection to the petitioner vide order dated 26.10.2021 after considering the effect of bar contained under Section 37 of the NDPS Act. Today, learned State Counsel has not opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, and therefore, the bar contained under Section 37 of the NDPS Act will not be applicable in the present case.

In view of the aforesaid facts and position, the present petition is allowed and the order dated 26.10.2021, whereby the petitioner granted interim bail, is hereby made absolute.

28.03.2022*Bhumika***(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE**

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes |
| 2. Whether reportable: | Yes/No |