

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-27492-2021

DATE OF DECISION: AUGUST 3, 2021

HARJINDER SINGH @ SETHI

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ.

PRESENT: MS. MANJU GOYAL, ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER.
MR. RAMANDEEP SANDHU, SR. DAG, PUNJAB.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.(ORAL)

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0056 dated 19.6.2021, under Section 353, 186, 341, 201, 506, 148, 149 IPC and Section 61/1/14 Excise Act, Police Station Sadar Rampura, District Bathinda, who apprehends his arrest at the hands of the police.

The allegations levelled in the FIR, as noticed by the Addl. Sessions Judge, Bathinda in the order dated 7.7.2021, are as under:-

“ASI Sikander Singh suffered a statement to the effect that present FIR was registered on the statement of complainant ASI Lakhwinder Singh wherein he alleged that he alongwith police party headed by SI/SHO Bikramjit Chauhan were present near Railway crossing village Jethu ke were HC Jagjit Singh received secret information which he shared with SHO and the complainant that coaccused Jugraj Singh @ Leelu and Paramjit Kaur are habitual of distilling illicit liquor in their houses and selling the same. If raid is conducted they can be apprehended and huge quantity of liquor can

be recovered. Upon this SHO alongwith two police officials raided the house of Jagjit Singh from where recovery of working still and illicit liquor was effected. Both the accused and their family members had an altercation with the police and other persons also gathered at the spot. They assaulted the police party and disposed off the recovered liquor and working still. Petitioner was also of them and is named in the FIR.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present FIR as the alleged recovery of lahan was effected from the house of the co-accused.

Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer on the ground that the petitioner let the assailants oppose the police party who had arrested the accused with the illicit lahan and in this regard, he has sent a footage of a video.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has not disputed the identity of the said person who is standing in front of the police vehicle in the video.

Considering the above background and the seriousness of allegations levelled, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court find that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of extra ordinary pre-arrest bail.

Dismissed.

August 3, 2021
Gulati

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Reportable : Yes/No

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No