

from the applicant; the offence with which the applicant is charged is against the society; that no enmity or ill-will has been established against the police officials by the defence counsel, therefore, he prayed for dismissal of the instant bail application.

4. Heard and perused record.

5. Admittedly the applicant was caught red handed with a huge amount of charas; that such a large quantity of charas was unlikely to have been foisted on him especially when no evidence of enmity in terms of malafide or ulterior motive is available on record, which might have actuated the complainant/police to falsely implicate him in the instant crime; that in the case of **Socha Gul v. The State (SCMR 2015 1077)**, it was held that bail should be granted sparingly in narcotics cases bearing in mind Section 51 of the Control of Narcotic Substances Act, 1997 and the fact that as per Socha Gul's case (Supra) the offense is a crime against society. With regard to the non-association of private persons, Section 25 of the CNSA exempted their presence in narcotics cases even otherwise the evidence of police officials is as good as any other citizen. Applicant's claim of false implication is an issue that cannot be attended without going beyond the scope of tentative assessment, a venture prohibited by law. In my view prima facie, there is sufficient material on record to connect the applicant with the commission of the offense.

7. In the above circumstances, the applicant has failed to make out a case for grant of bail, hence this bail application is dismissed.

8. Needless to say the observations made in this order are of a tentative nature and shall not be influenced the trial Court while deciding the case on merits.

JUDGE