

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

CRM-M-12080-2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision:-27.5.2020

Satish @ Shakti

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Additional A.G. Haryana.

*(the aforesaid presence is being recorded through video conferencing
since the proceedings are being conducted in Virtual Court)*

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in a case registered against him vide FIR No.90 dated 6.3.2020 under Section 420 IPC and Section 61 (Act. No.1) of Excise Act, 1914 at Police Station Kharkhoda, District Sonipat.
2. The FIR was lodged on the basis of secret information to the effect that two trucks of Shakti Thekedar (Contractor) containing illegal liquor were parked near Mobile Tower Gopalpur and that the said Contractor after purchasing the liquor from outside at cheaper rates sells the same at higher rates and earns profits. Pursuant to the said information, a raid was conducted and two trucks were found at the disclosed place from which 285 boxes of liquor were recovered, total containing 23,280 bottles (nips of liquor). It is further the case of prosecution that on the next day i.e. on 7.3.2020 Parmod and Ravinder were arrested and who suffered disclosure statement to the effect that on 4.3.2020, they had gone to Rajpura (Punjab) at the asking of liquor

Contractor Shakti who had handed over the aforesaid vehicles loaded with liquor.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the present case mainly on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused and that he was neither found at the spot nor the vehicles in question are registered in his name.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender having been involved in four other cases out of which he stands acquitted in one while three others are pending.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court. Bearing in mind the fact that the petitioner's name figures in the FIR itself and has also been named by the other two co-accused and that it is a case of heavy recovery and that the petitioner also stands involved in other cases, this Court does not find any special case for grant of anticipatory bail.
6. The petition is sans any merits and is hereby dismissed. However, in case the petitioner chooses to surrender before the trial Court within two weeks from today and moves an application for grant of regular bail, the trial Court shall endeavour to dispose of the same expeditiously, preferably within a period of ten days from filing of such application.

27.5.2020

kamal

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No