

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

102

**CRM-M-9206-2021  
Decided on : 26.02.2021**

Hardeep Singh @ Kacchu

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

PRESENT: Mr. G.S. Goraya, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Gaurav Garg Dhuriwala, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)**

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case FIR No. 221, dated 31.07.2020, under Section 302, 304, 307, 328, 120-B IPC and Sections 61-63 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 and under Section 6 of the Poison Act, 1919, registered at Police Station City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that neither is the petitioner named in the FIR nor any offence made out against him. He further contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case in hand, as is evident from his implication in four other cases of similar nature. He has further submitted that in the instant case, the name of the petitioner was placed in column No.2, while presenting the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. and it was stated that a separate challan would be presented *qua* him later on, on his arrest. It has been submitted that his false implication in the instant case is further evident from the fact that the petitioner was already in custody in other similar cases, however, the police still did not effect his arrest.

On the other hand, learned State counsel while opposing the

prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, has submitted that keeping in view the nature of offence, in which hundreds of people lost their life and eye-sight on consuming spurious liquor manufactured and sold by the petitioner, there is every possibility of the petitioner influencing the prosecution witnesses. It has also been urged that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential in the light of his involvement in cases of similar nature.

Heard.

In the circumstances, keeping in view the nature and gravity of allegations levelled against the petitioner as well as his involvement in other cases of similar nature registered against him, no ground is made out to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Petition stands dismissed accordingly.

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

**February 26, 2021**

*J.Ram*

*Whether speaking/reasoned:*      *Yes/No*  
*Whether Reportable:*              *Yes/No*