

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-38308-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-11.09.2018.

Amar Pal

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

Present: Mr. Deepender Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (Oral)

In the instant petition, petitioner has sought for anticipatory bail in case FIR No236 dated 28.05.2018 under Section 1/14/61/67 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 and Sections 420/472 IPC registered at Police Station Hodal, District Palwal (Haryana).

2.) One of the contention of the petitioner is that one Jitender @ Jeetu was a tenant to the petitioner. Therefore, implicating the petitioner is incorrect. To that extent, petitioner was asked to produce rental agreement between the petitioner and Jitender @ Jeetu. Today learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there was no rental agreement between the petitioner and Jitender @ Jeetu.

3.) As recovery of liquor bottles was from the premises of the petitioner and certain facts are required to be verified by the police from the petitioner like how illegally liquor was stocked etc. so, his custodial

interrogation is necessary. In view of these facts and circumstances, read

with the fact that recovery of large number of liquor bottles from the petitioner's premises, petitioner has not made out a case so as to extend him the benefit of anticipatory bail.

4.) Accordingly, petition stands dismissed.

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

September 11, 2018.
sandeep

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No.