

In virtual Court

CRM-M-3710-2021

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-3710-2021 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.01.2021

Manpreet Singh @ Mammu

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. K.S. Lakhanpal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.05 dated 05.01.2021 under Section 61/1/14 of Excise Act, registered at Police Station Model Town, Hoshiarpur, District Hoshiarpur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per allegations in the FIR, the police party received a secret information that one TATA-407 bearing registration No.PB-11CB-2887 is parked at Motor-Dera Purhera and one Vicky son of Jaggi is standing near the said vehicle. Vicky Bawa, petitioner-Manpreet Singh @ Mammu, Sanjeev Kumar and Lakhan Kumar

along with some unknown persons are also standing and huge quantity of illegal liquor, meant for sale outside the State of Punjab, is loaded in the same and if a raid is conducted, huge quantity of illegal liquor can be recovered. Upon receiving this information, FIR was registered and later on, a raid was conducted.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that during the raid, 95 boxes of UK No.1 whiskey containing 1140 bottles and 24 boxes of Rajdhani whiskey containing 288 bottles, total 1428 bottles of whiskey meant for sale in Chandigarh were recovered and two persons Sanjeev and Lakhan were arrested. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated on account of a dispute with the Investigating Officer and the police has shown recovery of a mobile phone, whereas this fact is not verified subsequently in the investigation, especially when during remand of other accused, arrested at the spot, there is no reference of recovery of any mobile phone.

Learned State counsel has, however, opposed the prayer for bail on the ground that when the raid was conducted, the petitioner ran away from the spot and he has been specifically named in the secret information as a person, who is involved in the business of illegal liquor. It is submitted that there are three more FIRs pending against the petitioner, out of which one is under The Excise Act and two FIRs are under IPC. It is further submitted that since the petitioner has been named in the secret information, considering his antecedents that he is involved in three more FIRs and also in view of the fact that huge

quantity of illegal liquor was recovered, the petitioner has no right to get anticipatory bail.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and looking into allegations in the FIR, I find no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, as his custodial interrogation is required.

Accordingly, present petition is dismissed.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

27.01.2021
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No