

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(105)

CRM-M-31435-2021

Date of decision: 06.08.2021

Jagwant Singh @ Jagga

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Atul Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

...

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (Oral)

The Court has been convened through video conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

Instant petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.121 dated 04.07.2021, registered for offence under Section 61 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914, at Police Station Sahnewal, District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana (Annexure P-3).

Counsel for the petitioner contends that instant petition came to be registered on the basis of secret information and on raid of godown of Harmohan Singh, who was arrested on the spot, 507 boxes containing fake liquor with fake labels, seals etc were recovered. During investigation, offence under Sections 420, 468, 471, 120-B, IPC were added. Counsel for the petitioner has contended that a false case has been foisted upon the petitioner. By referring to the Discharge Summary dated 06.06.2020 of a

hospital (Annexure P-4), he submits that the petitioner has undergone a surgery and he is not in a position to walk. Relying upon the photographs, CCTV footage as well as representation (Annexures P-1, P-2 and P-5, respectively), counsel urges that the petitioner has been falsely implicated.

I have considered the arguments addressed by counsel for the petitioner.

Petitioner is involved in 8 more cases, the details of which have been given in para 18 of the petition and most of the cases have been registered under the Punjab Excise Act, 1914. Anticipatory bail is not meant for a person who is involved in a number of criminal cases and that too with similar allegations. The recovery effected from the co-accused is huge and the name of the petitioner has been specifically mentioned in the FIR.

In these circumstances, the Court is of the view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is imperative and he is not entitled to the grant of pre-arrest bail.

Petition is dismissed.

It is clarified that nothing said hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression on the merits of the case.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

06.08.2021
Pardeep

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No