

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

102

CRM-M-59322-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 09.01.2023

GANGA

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Gautam Kaile, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AMAN CHAUDHARY. J.

The present petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. has been filed seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.419 dated 11.07.2022, registered under Section 20, 21, 21(C) of the NDPS Act registered at Police Station Ambala Cantt. District Ambala.

Briefly put, as per the FIR, on receipt of secret information having been received by the Police, co-accused Parveen Kumar alias Vinay was apprehended with the alleged contraband.

Learned counsel would contend that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and she was nominated on basis of the disclosure statements of co-accused Parveen Kumar alias Vinay, who was arrested at the spot, alongwith the alleged contraband. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is ex-wife of the accused-Parveen Kumar alias Vinay and she has been dragged into this case just to settle his score with the petitioner. He places reliance on the judgment in the case of **Tofan Singh vs. State of Tamil Nadu**, 2020 AIR

(Supreme Court) 5592 to contend that the disclosure statement is inadmissible in evidence. The petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency. Thus, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to her.

On advance notice, learned State counsel puts in appearance and opposes the prayer on the ground that the recovery effected in the present case is commercial and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in the instant case to find the source of origin and the entire chain of supply of contraband.

Heard.

It is apposite to make a reference to the order of Hon'ble The Supreme Court of India in the case of **Prabhulal vs. Central Bureau of Narcotics**, wherein the SLP (Crl.) 6722-2022 was dismissed vide order dated 14.12.2022, affirming the order of dismissal of anticipatory bail by Madhya Pradesh High Court, by observing thus:-

“We have heard learned counsel for the parties. We find no reason to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner as prayed for. The Special Leave Petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

The interim protection granted by order dated 11.10.2022 stands vacated in view of the dismissal of the special leave petition.

However, if the petitioner surrenders and apply for regular bail, the same may be considered by the Trial Court as expeditiously as possible on its own merits in accordance with law.”

Furthermore in the case of **State of Haryana vs. Samarth Kumar**, 2022 LiveLaw (SC) 622, Hon'ble The Supreme Court of India has held thus:-

“7. The order of the Special Court granting regular bail to the

respondents shows that the said order was passed in pursuance of the anticipatory bail granted by the High Court. Therefore, the same cannot be a ground to hold that the present appeals have become infructuous.

8. In cases of this nature, the respondents may be able to take advantage of the decision in *Tofan Singh vs. State of Tamil Nadu* (supra), perhaps at the time of arguing the regular bail application or at the time of final hearing after conclusion of the trial.

9. To grant anticipatory bail in a case of this nature is not really warranted. Therefore, we are of the view that the High Court fell into error in granting anticipatory bail to the respondents.

10. In view of the above, the appeals are allowed. The impugned orders are set aside. As a consequence, the Appellate –State is entitled to take steps, in accordance with law.”

In the case in hand, the FIR is under Section 29-85 NDPS Act in addition to Section 20, 21, 21-C, 61 of the NDPS Act. The name of the petitioner has surfaced based on the disclosure statements of co-accused Praveen Kumar alias Vinay, who was apprehended at the spot and recovery of 544 capsules of Spas-Parvion plus weighing 292.7 gms was effected from him. The sole ground taken by the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail in view of the judgment in the case of **Tofan Singh** (supra) that the disclosure statement of co-accused is inadmissible, has no force, as per the law laid down by Hon'ble The Supreme Court of India in the cases of **Prabhulal** and **Samarth Kumar** (supra). Thus, the allegations against the petitioner call for a deeper probe, to unearth the modus operandi, source of origin, chain of supply and also to find out the involvement of other persons therein, so as to also eradicate the menace of drug proliferating, for which the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. The grant of

pre-arrest bail in the present case shall be detrimental to the investigation.

The stringent provisions as contained in the statute, are to deal with the drug menace, plaguing the society, as the youth are being led on a path having deleterious effects, thereby destroying the very social fabric.

Keeping in view the aforesaid, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. As a sequel thereto, the present petition being bereft of merit, is hereby dismissed.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

January 09, 2023

S.Sharma(syr)

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