

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

CRM-M-15570-2023

Date of Decision:-27.07.2023

Angrej Singh @ Geja.

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present:- None for the Petitioner.

Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

The Prayer in this petition under Section 439 Cr.PC is for the grant of regular bail in case FIR No.90 dated 24.09.2021 under Sections 22(c) of the NDPS Act registered at Police Station Bajakhana, District Faridkot.

2. The brief facts of the case are that while the police party was on patrolling duty, two young men were seen coming on a motor cycle from the front side of village Ghannia. On seeing the police party they got confused and tried to turn around their motor cycle bearing no.PB-04-AA-3074. However, they slipped and one envelope of intoxicating tablets fell out of a transparent bag in the hands of the young man sitting pillion. The persons were nabbed. The driver of the motor cycle disclosed his name as Sandeep Singh @ Sipa and the person sitting on the rear seat told his name as Angrej Singh @ Geja (petitioner). The recovery of 2000 intoxicating tablets came to be effected from the 04 boxes in possession of the petitioner and his co-

accused.

3. None has put in appearance on behalf of the petitioner. However, I have gone through the records of the case.

4. The Counsel for the State contends that commercial quantity of contraband has been recovered from the petitioner. He was also an accused in two cases bearing FIR No.60 dated 8.7.2018 under Sections 22/61/85 NDPS Act P.S. Bajakhana and FIR No.24 dated 10.03.2020 under Sections 22/61/85 NDPS Act P.S. Bajakhana, Therefore, in view of the bar contained under Section 37 of the NDPS Act the petitioner was not entitled to the grant of bail.

5. I have heard learned Counsel for State.

6. Admittedly, the recovery from the petitioner and his co-accused is of commercial quantity of contraband. Further he is an accused in two other cases under the NDPS Act. In this situation, the satisfaction as required under Section 37 of the NDPS Act cannot be recorded.

7. In view of the above, I find no merit in the present petition and the same stands dismissed.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

July 27, 2023
Vinay

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