

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

207

**CRM-M-40970-2020
Date of decision: 27.07.2021**

Chhinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Kuldip Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rana Harjasdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J. (ORAL)

(The case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.)

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, "the Cr.P.C") for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.93 dated 05.07.2020 registered under Section 61 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 at Police Station Arni Wala, District Fazilka

Vide order dated 23.12.2020, Co-ordinate Bench of this Court had granted interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner with direction to join the investigation.

The petition has been opposed by the learned State Counsel. However, no reply has been filed by the respondent-State.

I have heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned State Counsel and have gone through the record.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the

petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. The present FIR is an outcome of a party fraction in the village. The above said FIR was registered against the petitioner on the basis of secret information. The petitioner was not apprehended on the spot and no recovery was made from him. Recovery of 450 litres of lahan and 5 bottles of illicit liquor has been falsely implanted on him with allegations of the petitioner having escaped from the spot. In compliance with order dated 23.12.2020, the petitioner has joined the investigation and he may be granted anticipatory bail as his custodial interrogation is not required in the case.

On the other hand, learned State Counsel has vehemently opposed the petition and submitted that in view of gravity of accusation, the petitioner does not deserve grant of anticipatory bail. Therefore, the petition may be dismissed.

However, learned State Counsel has acknowledged that in compliance with order dated 23.12.2020 passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation and that his custodial interrogation is not required in the case.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation against the petitioner, the fact that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required in the case and there is no material to justify the apprehension of the petitioner fleeing from justice or tampering with evidence or criminally intimidating the prosecution witnesses, but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the grant of anticipatory bail.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and order dated 23.12.2020 granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation again if and as and when called upon to do so and shall comply with the conditions enumerated under Section 438(2) (i) to (iii) of the Cr.P.C. In view of Section 438(2)(iv) read with Section 437(3)(b) of the Cr.P.C. anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner shall also be subject to the condition that he shall not commit any similar offence under the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 after his release on anticipatory bail. In case of non-compliance of the above-said conditions, the petitioner shall not be entitled to the protection of anticipatory bail allowed to him.

27.07.2021

Vinay

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No