



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

244

CRM-M-63253-2024

Date of decision: 09.01.2025

NAVEEN FOGAT

....Petitioner

V/s

NCB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Gaurav Singla, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. TAJeshwar Singh Sullar, Advocate with
Mr. Himanshu Bansal, Advocate for the respondent-NCB.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is third petition which has been filed by the petitioner seeking interim bail for a period of 30 days for performing the last rites of his father and for getting his sister operated upon for some eye ailment.

2. Reply by way of affidavit of Sh. Sachin Kumar, Inspector, Narcotics Control Bureau, Delhi Zonal Unit, Delhi, has been filed in Court today on behalf of respondent. The same is taken on record subject to all just exceptions. A copy thereof has been handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. At the outset, learned counsel appearing for the NCB has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. It has been submitted that it is a matter of record that the petitioner is facing trial in total of three cases under the NDPS Act involving huge recoveries of contraband; the petitioner is the kingpin of a



large syndicate and in case, he is enlarged even on interim bail, there is a genuine possibility that he could abscond as a result of which the conclusion of the trial would be affected or he could yet again be involved in some other case under the NDPS Act. It has also been submitted by the learned counsel for the NCB that the petitioner had approached this Court twice earlier seeking similar relief for performing the last rites of his deceased father, however, in view of his previous criminal antecedents, his prayer for being released on interim bail for the aforesaid purpose had been declined.

4. Learned counsel for the NCB has further submitted that although the petitioner was also seeking the concession of interim bail also for the purpose of getting his sister operated for some eye ailment, however when verification was done in the said regard, it came to the fore that his sister had not been advised surgery by any doctor and it was only for some routine eye examination that the petitioner wanted to accompany his sister. It has been still further asserted by the counsel for the NCB that the mother of the petitioner is living with his sister and there is nothing which stops his mother from accompanying his sister to the doctor for her routine eye examination.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, has reiterated that being a son his presence would be required for performing the last rites of his father who died more than a year back.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.



7. In view of the *prima facie* involvement of the petitioner in several drug related cases, this Court is not inclined to extend the concession of interim bail to him as it concurs with the submissions made by learned counsel for the NCB that the possibility of the petitioner absconding or even getting involved in some other drug related cases cannot be ruled out.

8. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the instant petition is dismissed. 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.

January 09, 2025
poonam

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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