



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

213

CRM-M-6705-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 02.05.2024

VICKY SINGH

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR (Annexure P-1) as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
41	06.08.2023	22 and 29 of the NDPS Act	Cheema, District Sangrur

2. Arguments heard.
3. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case on the alleged disclosure statement made by co-accused Raj Kaur. He submits that the petitioner is not concerned with the alleged transaction and is ready



to join investigation, hence, prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel while referring to the status report submitted by the State has stated that the name of the petitioner figured in the disclosure statement of co-accused Raj Kaur during her interrogation, who was apprehended with 850 Tramadol Prolonged-release tablets IP Tramatrast SR-100, which is commercial quantity and the petitioner had played an active role in the transaction, as the recovered tablets were supplied by the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner is facing 11 more cases under the NDPS Act and Excise Act and his custodial interrogation is required for unearthing the sources of intoxicant tablets. He thus prayed for dismissal of the petition.

5. Considering the respective arguments and perusing the record, it is the case of the prosecution that co-accused Raj Kaur was apprehended by the Police on 06.08.2023 on the basis of secret information and from her possession 850 Tramadol Prolonged-release tablets IP Tramatrast SR-100 were recovered and during her interrogation, she disclosed that she got the same from the present petitioner and accordingly he was nominated in the case. The recovered intoxicant tablets fall within the purview of commercial quantity. The antecedents of the petitioner would reveal that the petitioner is already involved in 11 more criminal cases under the NDPS Act as well as Excise Act in different police stations.

6. In these circumstances, considering the nature and gravity of offence, it is observed that no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, as a consequence, the petition is hereby dismissed.



7. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

02.05.2024

S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No