

CRM-M-8427-2022

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

CRM-M-8427-2022

Date of decision: 24.03.2022

Ravinder

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Digvijay Nagpal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.20 dated 27.01.2022, registered at Police Station Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, under Section 61 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914.

As per the case of the prosecution, when the police party reached the bridge of canal in the area of village Panjawa, one silver grey colour Innova Car, bearing registration No.HR 57-7177 was parked there; that the window-pane of the rear seat of the car was broken and nobody was there in the car and that 57 boxes of liquor (meant to be sold in Haryana) were recovered from the said car, owned by the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case and that the aforesaid

CRM-M-8427-2022

recovery is false and a planted one for the reason that as per the prosecution version itself, the window-pane of the rear seat of the car was broken.

On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that a huge recovery of liquor, meant to be sold in Haryana, was effected from the car, owned by the petitioner, and that the petitioner is involved in intra-state smuggling of liquor.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The car from which the aforesaid recovery of liquor was effected, is owned by the petitioner. There is a remote chance that such a huge recovery could be planted by the police at the instance of someone and that only because of some unexplained political reason. No explanation is forthcoming as to how the car owned by the petitioner happened to be parked at the place of occurrence.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence, I find that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation to unearth the racket of intra-state smuggling of liquor.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

24.03.2022

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No