

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

Sr.No.102

CRM-M No.29258 of 2020

Date of Decision: 23rd September, 2020.

Seema Rani

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(Heard through Video-conferencing)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present: Mr. D.S.Nigha, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr.Manreet Singh Nagra, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA (ORAL)

In the present petition, the petitioner has sought the relief of pre-arrest bail in the criminal case registered at Police Station Sadar Jalalabad, District Fazilka, vide FIR No.104 dated 01.08.2020, under Section 61 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 with the allegations of her having been found in possession of 20 bottles of illicit liquor.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Manreet Singh Nagra, AAG, Punjab, who has joined the proceedings in pursuance of the advance copy of the petition having been sent to the respondent, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a poor lady and she has been falsely implicated in the present case and therefore, she deserves the benefit of pre-arrest bail.

However, learned State counsel submits that about 20 days prior to the present occurrence, the petitioner had been booked in another criminal case of the similar nature and she is habitual of committing the offences of such nature.

As per the allegations levelled against the petitioner in the case in hand, she was found in possession of 20 bottles of illicit liquor and thereafter, she had run away from the spot. In Para No.3 of the order dated 21.08.2020 as passed by Learned Additional Sessions Judge declining the relief of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner, it has been specifically mentioned that Learned Additional PP had argued that another FIR had been registered against the petitioner under the Excise Act because of her having been apprehended alongwith the working still, 250 litre lahan and 15 bottles of illicit liquor.

Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner allegedly fled away from the spot and also the fact that she is already involved in another criminal case of the similar nature as mentioned above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Resultantly, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

23.09.2020.
seema

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
Whether Reportable?	Yes/No