

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

**CRM-M-53127-2021
Date of decision: 14.01.2022**

Sobit**...Petitioner**

Versus

State of Punjab**...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN**

Present:- Mr. K. S. Bal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

(Through video conferencing)

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

This is the second petition that has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 122 dated 05.05.2020 registered under Sections 489-A, 489-B, 467, 468, 471 of the IPC at Police Station Division No. 8, District Jalandhar.

The first petition, bearing CRM-M-16255-2020, was dismissed as withdrawn on 23.06.2020 by passing the following order:

“Case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 122 dated 05.05.2020 registered under Sections 489-A and 489-B IPC and Section 21 of the NDPS Act at Police Station Division No. 8, District Jalandhar.

According to prosecution, on 05.05.2020, on the basis of secret information a raid was conducted at the disclosed place and co-accused of petitioner, namely; Naresh Kumar @ Neesha, was apprehended with conscious possession of counterfeit currency notes in the denomination of ₹8,00,000/-. During his interrogation,

he made a confessional statement that he had brought the said counterfeit currency notes from his friend Puneet Sodhi. On further interrogation of aforesaid Puneet Sodhi, he was also found having possession of ₹2,00,000/- counterfeit currency notes. He named the petitioner as supplier of aforesaid counterfeit currency notes to the tune of ₹10,00,000/-.

Heard.

After giving anxious consideration to the lengthy arguments submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner, when the Bench was not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, learned counsel prays that she may be permitted to withdraw the instant case.

Ordered accordingly.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is a change of circumstance as Section 21 of the NDPS Act stands deleted.

Be whatsoever, it is a fact that FIR pertains to May, 2020 and despite the lapse of a period of about one year and six months, the petitioner has not surrendered before the trial Court and is delaying the proceedings.

Learned State counsel has heavily opposed the prayer of the petitioner on the ground that even while dismissing the first petition of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, the allegations against the petitioner under Sections 489-A and 489-B of the IPC were duly considered.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, considering the aforesaid facts, no ground is made out to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

14.01.2022

Waseem Ansari

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No