

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

104

CRM-M-37922-2025
DECIDED ON: 28.07.2025

MOHD.AARIF @ TUFANIPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Mohit Kumar, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. On 18.07.2025, following order was passed by this Court:-

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Mohd. Aarif Tufani, aged about 27 years	0063	25.05.2023	21 of NDPS Act, 1985 (Section 29 of NDPS Act added later on)	City-II Malerkotla	Malerkotla

2. It is noticed that initially petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail by learned Judge, Special Court, Sangrur, vide its order dated 03.07.2023, with a direction to join investigation within seven days from the date of order. However, despite granting of interim anticipatory bail, investigation was not joined by the petitioner, and on that account, same has been dismissed vide order dated 04.07.2024.

From the impugned order dated 04.07.2025, it has been noticed that petitioner gave an explanation that “he had gone to Jamat for religious purpose for four months and could not join the investigation in time”.

3. *In the said impugned order, the trial Court has given its observation that even after deducting four months time, there was sufficient time to join the investigation by the accused (petitioner herein). Therefore, he failed to comply with the order and no plausible reason has been assigned for non-joining of investigation in pursuance to order dated 03.07.2023.*

This is how the bail application was filed by the trial Court/lower court.

4. *Since, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner, in the interest of justice, adjourned to 28.07.2025.”*

2. Today, on the very outset, counsel for the petitioner seeks withdrawal of the present petition.

3. Accordingly, present petition stands dismissed as withdrawn.

28.07.2025

Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>