

CRM-M-39435-2023

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

**CRM-M-39435-2023
Date of Decision: 11.08.2023**

Amar Singh Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJBIR SEHRAWAT

Present : Mr. Kuldeep Singh Siwach, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAJBIR SEHRAWAT, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.190 dated 24.06.2023 registered under Sections 15 and 27-A (Act of 61) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, at Police Station City Ratia, District Fatehabad.

2. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the case against the petitioner is totally false and concocted. The petitioner is not involved in the crime as alleged against him in the present case. Even as per the story of the police, the name of the petitioner has been surfaced in the alleged disclosure statement made by his co-accused Chhinda Singh from whom 30 Kgs. of poppy husk have been recovered. However, except the disclosure statement, there is nothing with the police to substantiate the allegations against the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner deserves to be protected against his arrest. It is further submitted by the learned counsel that the petitioner is ready to join investigation and to cooperate with the

CRM-M-39435-2023

Investigating Officer as and when called by the police.

3. Notice of motion.
4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Randhir Singh, Additional Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and vehemently opposed the petition.
5. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the State that the petitioner is duly involved in the drug peddling. The person, from whom a heavy consignment of poppy husk have been recovered, has specifically named the petitioner as the supplier of the material. Not only that, there is another case against the petitioner. The police need the custodial interrogation of the present petitioner so as to unearth the true dimensions of the alleged crime committed by the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner does not deserve to be protected against his arrest.
6. In view of the above facts and circumstances of the case, as well as, the above-said submissions made by the learned State counsel, this Court does not find it appropriate to interfere with the matter so as to grant concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
7. Dismissed.

(RAJBIR SEHRAWAT)
JUDGE

11.08.2023
adhikari

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No