

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

CRM-M No.51005 of 2022
Date of decision: 2nd March, 2023

Paramjeet @ Pamma

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Vikas K. Rana, Advocate for
Mr. Anirudh S. Shera, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Chetan Sharma, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.425 dated 12.09.2022 under Sections 18/61/85 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Taraori, District Karnal.

Vide order dated 09.11.2022, the petitioner had been granted concession of interim bail in the following terms:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that the petitioner has been indicted in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, Jagtar Singh from whom recovery of 60 gram 50 miligram opium had been effected; that as per the prosecution version, the petitioner had supplied the contraband to the aforesaid co-

accused; that the extent of contraband recovered in the present case, falls under the category of 'small quantity', and that there is no other case registered or pending against the petitioner, at least of a similar nature. In support of his contentions, learned counsel relies upon the order dated 27.10.2022 passed by a Coordinate Bench in CRM-M-41493-2022, titled as 'Baldev Raj Vs. State of Punjab'.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 09.11.2022, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Balwan Singh, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 09.11.2022 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted to him.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

March 2, 2023

rps

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No