

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

101

2024:PHHC:058853
CRM-M-16920-2024
Date of decision: April 30th, 2024

Narinder Pal Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Harsimrat Randhawa, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

On 08.04.2024, following order was passed:-

“The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.0066 dated 07.09.2023 for the offences under Sections 18(b)/27-A of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (Section 29 of the NDPS Act added later on) registered at Police Station Ghumman Kalan, District Gurdaspur.

Learned counsel inter alia contends that a false case has been planted upon the petitioner and that too on the basis of a disclosure statement allegedly suffered by co-accused Ravinder Singh, who stated that the drug money as well as the Opium recovered from him had been supplied by the petitioner. Learned counsel submits that evidentiary value of such a disclosure statement is of a weak nature and it points to his false implication. On a pointed query put to the learned counsel as to whether the petitioner has any criminal antecedents, he prays for an adjournment to place on record details of the other criminal case(s) which stand registered against the petitioner.

On request, adjourned to 18.04.2024.”

2. In compliance of the above order, learned counsel for the petitioner has placed on record the judgment dated 13.02.2017 passed by learned Judge, Special Court, Sangrur, wherein it stands reflected

that the petitioner was convicted in FIR No.107 dated 29.08.2013 under Sections 15 and 25 of the NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Chhajli and sentenced vide order dated 14.02.2017 to undergo rigorous imprisonment for ten years and to pay fine of ₹1,00,000/- under Section 15 (C) of the Act and rigorous imprisonment for ten years and to pay fine of ₹1,00,000/- under Section 25 of the Act. Thus, it is evident that after his sentence was suspended, he had yet again been involved in a case under the NDPS Act since the present FIR was registered on 07.09.2023.

3. In the aforementioned facts and circumstances, the petitioner does not deserve to be extended the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail.

4. The instant petition stands dismissed.

5. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

April 30th, 2024
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No