

103

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

-.-

CRM M 35928-2023
Date of Decision 27.07.2023*Karanvir Singh alias Karanveer Singh**.....Petitioner**versus**State of Punjab**...Respondent***Coram Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajbir Sehrawat**

Present: Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner

-.-

Rajbir Sehrawat, J, (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, praying for grant of anticipatory/pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 0120 dated 12.06.2023 registered under Section 15, 18 and 25 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, at Police Station Samrala, Police District Khanna, District Ludhiana (Annexure P-1).

It is submitted by counsel for the petitioner that case against the petitioner is totally false, frivolous and concocted. The petitioner is not involved in the crime as alleged against him. The name of the petitioner has surfaced only on the disclosure statement of the co-accused from whom some contraband has been recovered. It is further submitted that the petitioner is not involved either in the purchase or supply of the said material. The only assertion of the co-accused is that when he informed the petitioner regarding having opium, the petitioner suggested him to conceal

the said consignment in the fields. Even the said fields do not belong to the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner deserves to be protected against his arrest.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Sandeep Singh, Additional Advocate General, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent State.

Counsel for the State, on instructions from SI Jaswinder Singh, Police Station Samrala, Ludhiana has submitted that the petitioner is directly involved in the present case as well; because the contraband has been recovered from the Car of the petitioner. Not only that, the petitioner is facing another case under the NDPS Act. The investigation is at the initial stage and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to unearth the true dimensions of the crime being committed by the petitioner and his co-accused. Therefore, the petitioner does not deserve any protection against his arrest at this stage.

In view of the assertions led by counsel for the State, this Court does not find any ground to grant the concession of anticipatory/pre-arrest bail to the petitioner, at this stage.

Dismissed.

(Rajbir Sehrawat)
Judge

July 27, 2023
mohan bimbra

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