

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

**Crl. Misc. No.M- 35903 of 2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision: September 11, 2019**

Ravinder Singh

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. J.S.Cooner, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Avtar Singh Sandhu, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

SURINDER GUPTA, J.(Oral)

Heard.

The police registered FIR No. 69 dated 17.05.2019 for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of Indian Penal Code and 61 of Punjab Excise Act at Police Station Lalru, District SAS Nagar, Mohali on the basis of secret information that in an abandoned factory situated near Lalru Mandi. Some persons namely Harvinder Singh Chadha @ Manga Chadha, J.D. and Loven Sharma were carrying on the business of production of illicit liquor. A raid was conducted on which 12000 bottles of liquor and machinery required from distilling liquor was recovered from the spot.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Dilbag Singh submits that during investigation it has been found that the premises is owned by Sukhdev Singh. The petitioner had introduced Harvinder Singh

Chadha to him for letting out of that premises. However, a rent note was prepared in the name of fictitious person Harmesh Singh. During investigation, Harvinder Singh Chadha disclosed that the entire machinery and other infrastructure for distilling the liquor was arranged and supplied by the petitioner. The rent note in favour of fictitious person Harmesh Singh was signed by Lakhwinder Singh and Parveen. It has come to notice of the police that Parveen is also a non-existent person. The custodial interrogation of petitioner is required in this case.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is not named in the FIR. The main accused namely Harvinder Singh Chadha and Loven Sharma, who have been named in the FIR were allowed interim anticipatory bail. The petitioner is also ready to join the investigation.

At this stage, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner was also named in the FIR as J.D. (video director). He has moved an application to Senior Superintendent of Police mentioning himself as J.D. (video director), pleadings his innocence.

In view of the facts stated by learned State counsel that has emerged during investigation, I am of the considered opinion that role of the petitioner in this case requires to be verified for which his custodial interrogation is required. No reason is made out to grant him anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE

September 11, 2019

Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No