

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr.No.102

CRM-M No.20935 of 2021

Date of Decision: 26th May, 2021.

Amrjeet Singh @ Ramu Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

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

Present: Mr. Balraj Singh Sidhu Advocate,
for the petitioner.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)

Apprehending his arrest in the criminal case as registered at Police Station Nehianwala, Bathinda, vide FIR No.38 dated 28.03.2021 under Section 61 of the Excise Act 1914, the petitioner has preferred this petition for seeking the relief of anticipatory bail.

Shorn and short of unnecessary details, the allegations, as levelled in this case, are that the police party, headed by ASI Mukand Singh, received a secret information to the effect that the petitioner, along-with his co-accused Kamaljit Sharma and Harry, had been indulging in smuggling the country made liquor from Haryana to the State of Punjab and in pursuance thereof, a raid was conducted and the said accused Kamaljit Sharma was apprehended and 60 bottles of country made liquor were recovered from his possession and thereafter, 24 bottles of such liquor were also recovered from

his house.

Notice of motion.

Ms. Rashmi Attri, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, who has joined the proceedings in this case in pursuance of the copy of this petition having been sent to the respondent-State in advance, accepts the notice.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel in the present petition and have also perused the file thoroughly.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the alleged recovery of liquor has already been effected and the petitioner is ready to join in the investigation and therefore, he should be extended the concession as prayed for by him in this petition.

However, learned State counsel argues that besides the present case, six more cases of the similar nature were registered against the petitioner and he is facing trial in three of those cases and thus, he is a habitual offender and therefore, he does not deserve the relief of anticipatory bail.

Though the alleged recovery of 84 bottles of country made liquor has already been effected in the present case but this Court cannot lose sight of the fact that besides the instant case, the petitioner is involved in six more cases of the similar nature. Moreover, in such circumstances, the possibility of the requirement of the custodial interrogation of the petitioner regarding several facets of the crime, as alleged to have been committed by him, cannot be ruled out.

As a sequel to the fore-going discussion, it follows that this petition deserves dismissal. Resultantly, the same is hereby dismissed.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

26.05.2021.
seema

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