

[219] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-4058-2024

Date of Decision : 12.02.2024

Rajinder Singh ...Petitioner
versus

State of PunjabRespondent

Coram : **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA**

Present : Ms. Renu Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, DAG, Punjab.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

[1] Status report by way of affidavit dated 12.02.2024 of Shri Palvinder Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub division Kartarpur, District Jalandhar (Rural), on behalf of the respondent-State has been filed in Court today. The same is taken on record.

[2] On 25.01.2024, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“ Present: Ms. Renu Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

By way of present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0046 dated 21.04.2023 registered under Section 22 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (Section 342/420 IPC added later on) at Police Station Maqsudan District Jalandhar.

As per allegations, Drug Inspector Jalandhar along with policy party raided a De-addiction / Rehabilitation Punjab Centre situated at VPO Gazipur, District Jalandhar and found various irregularities therein. Different kinds of medicines were found to be lying at the spot without any permission. It is also the allegation of the prosecution that the place under De-addiction Centre is owned by Vishal, who had further given it on lease to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has nothing to do with the De-addiction/ Rehabilitation Centre in question. Learned counsel has drawn attention towards Annexure P.3, copy of bail petition, which was moved by Vishal Sharma, the owner of the Centre in the same FIR and in which he had clearly mentioned that he had

given his property to Pardhan Prabhjot Singh son of Shri Baljinder Singh, resident of Village Talwandi Chaudhrian, District Kapurthala on rent. Learned counsel further contends that in order to save said Pardhan Prabhjot Singh, petitioner has been falsely roped in. It is still further contended that the recovered quantity of intoxicant contraband falls in the non-commercial category.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Anmol Singh Sandhu, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent- State. Copy of the petition be supplied to him during course of the day.

On instructions from ASI Jatinder Kumar, learned State Counsel though insists that it is the petitioner who was running the De-Addiction Centre but concedes the fact that recovered intoxicant tablets falls in the non-commercial category.

Adjourned to 12.02.2024 for filing status report.

In the meantime, in case of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/ Investigating Officer. However, it is further directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when so required by the Investigating Officer. He shall not contact any person associated with the case to dissuade him from the investigation in any manner whatsoever and nor shall leave the country without prior permission of the Court. He shall further comply with the conditions stipulated in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C”

[3] Today, learned State Counsel, has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 25.01.2024 and is no longer required for further investigation.

[4] In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 25.01.2024, whereby the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute. However, he shall continue to join investigation, if and so required by the Investigating Officer.

[5] Disposed of.

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

12.02.2024