



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

CRM-M-23042-2024

Date of Decision: May 09, 2024

Sarabjit Singh @ Laddi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Nimanyu Gautam, Advocate for the petitioner.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.(Oral)

By way of present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., petitioner prays for grant of pre-arrest bail in case FIR No.166 dated 19.10.2023, under Sections 18, 29, 27 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (for short 'the NDPS Act'), registered at Police Station GRP, Ludhiana.

2. As per the prosecution allegations, 6 Kg. each of opium was recovered from the possession of co-accused, namely, Mohd. Asif and Khatun Begam, i.e. total recovery of 12 KG. opium. In their disclosure statements, both of them nominated one Mohd. Imran to be the supplier. The interrogation of co-accused Mohd. Asif revealed that 04 Kg. of opium was to be supplied to the petitioner Sarabjit Singh @ Laddi, who had already paid ₹6 lacs in advance to Mohd. Asif.

3. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated; that petitioner has no connection with co-accused - Mohd. Asif.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State.

**CRM-M-23042-2024****- 2 -**

6. Learned State counsel has drawn attention towards the order dated 30.04.2024 passed by learned Judge, Special Court, Ludhiana, in which it has been observed that amount of ₹6 lacs was withdrawn by the petitioner from the bank for making payment to Mohd. Asif. Both of them had visited the bank together. Learned State counsel has also shown certain photographs before the Court, showing that petitioner alongwith Mohd. Asif had visited the bank on 06.10.2023 and on the same date amount was withdrawn by him.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner has tried to justify that in fact the petitioner had purchased certain articles on that date, but this Court is not convinced with the said contention, having regard to the disclosure statement of co-accused and the fact that the petitioner was also earlier involved in one more case pertaining to NDPS Act, as per details given in para No.26 of the petition.

8. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Jagtar Singh, informs that in fact petitioner is involved in two more cases of NDPS Act.

9. After considering submission of both the sides, this Court is not inclined to grant the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner as his custodial interrogation may be necessary. As such, present petition is dismissed.

May 09, 2024

sarita

**(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE**Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No