



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

CRM-M No.36879 of 2024
Date of decision: 1st August, 2024

Harpreet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Gursimran S. Bawa, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 482 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.6 dated 11.01.2024 under Sections 21(c) and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Special Task Force, Distt. STF Wing SAS Nagar.

2. Learned counsel inter alia submits that the petitioner was neither present with the co-accused Balraj Singh when the latter was intercepted by the police and recovery of 280 grams of Heroin affected from him, nor was he anywhere in the vicinity of the said area; later on, in a disclosure statement allegedly suffered by the co-accused Balraj Singh it was claimed that the petitioner had been supplying him the recovered contraband. It has also been submitted that since the petitioner has no criminal antecedents, his false implication in the present case is thus evident.



3. I have heard learned counsel and perused the relevant material on record.

4. A perusal of the FIR in question, which has been annexed as Annexure P-1, reveals that a specific secret information was received qua the involvement of co-accused Balraj Singh as well as the petitioner in drug trafficking and it was only pursuant thereto, co-accused Balraj Singh was apprehended by the police and thereafter, recovery of 280 grams of Heroin (commercial quantity) was allegedly affected from him. The contention of the learned counsel that the petitioner was not present with the co-accused Balraj Singh when the latter was intercepted by the police and recovery of 280 grams of Heroin affected, particularly in view of the specific secret information having been received qua the petitioner, holds no water.

5. In the circumstances, no ground is made out to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case. The petition is dismissed in limine. 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.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

August 1, 2024
rps

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