



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that earlier one FIR No.03 dated 08.01.2024 under Sections 21, 61 of NDPS Act (offence under Sections 29 and 85 of NDPS Act added later on), Police Station Gharinda, District Amritsar Rural was registered against the present petitioner and he was arrested in the said case. The petitioner applied for grant of regular bail before this Court by way of CRM-M-15002-2024 and vide order dated 04.07.2024 (Annexure P-2), he was granted the concession of bail by this Court. In pursuance of the order dated 04.07.2024 (Annexure P-2), the bail bonds were furnished before the trial Court and the grandfather of the petitioner had

arranged the sureties. However, later on, it was found that the surety bonds were fake and the petitioner was again taken in custody. The petitioner again applied for grant of concession of bail and he was again granted the concession of bail by this Court, vide order dated 25.03.2025 (Annexure P-6). He further contends that the petitioner has already remained in custody for more than two months on account of filing of fake sureties in the earlier case i.e. FIR No.03 dated 08.01.2024 under Sections 21, 61 of NDPS Act (offence under Sections 29 and 85 of NDPS Act added lateron) at Police Station Gharinda, District Amritsar Rural. He further contends that at the time when sureties were submitted before the trial Court, the petitioner was in custody and the surety-Jaspal Singh was arranged by his grandfather-Balkar Singh. However, the grandfather of the petitioner has already expired on 17.12.2024. He further contends that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. It is not in dispute that the petitioner was taken in custody by the trial Court, when the surety bonds were found to be fake and remained in custody for over two months. However, vide order dated 25.03.2025 (Annexure P-6), he was granted the concesson of regular bail by this Court. After his release, the present FIR has been got registered by the trial Court against him. Thus, in the considered opinion of the Court, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required.

6. Without commenting any further on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of BNSS. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and he shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of BNSS.

04.07.2025

hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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