

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

**CRM-M No.24252 of 2021
Date of Decision: 27.01.2022**

Manjit Kaur

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent.

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

Present:- Mr. L.M. Gulati, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Samina Dhir, D.A.G, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.

Apprehending her arrest in the criminal case pertaining to the FIR bearing No.169 dated 24.08.2020 registered at Police Station Majitha, District Amritsar, under Section 61 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 (for short, 'the Act'), the petitioner has preferred this petition for seeking the relief of anticipatory bail.

Bereft of unnecessary details, the allegations, as levelled against the petitioner in the present case, are that on 24.08.2020, on receipt of a secret information regarding her (petitioner's) having been indulging in the sale of illicit liquor, the police party raided at her house but she managed to escape from there. However, the search of the premises

resulted in the recovery of 50 Kg. '*Lahan*'.

Reply has already been filed on behalf of the respondent-State, by way of the affidavit of Assistant Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division, Majitha.

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 petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case whereas she has no concern with the alleged recovery of '*Lahan*' and moreover, she has two daughters of marriageable age and therefore, she deserves the relief as prayed for in the instant petition.

However, learned State counsel argues that on noticing the raiding party coming to her house, the petitioner had fled away from the spot and she is also involved in one more case of the similar nature and keeping in view the gravity of the offence committed by her, this petition be dismissed.

Concededly, the name of the petitioner finds specific mention in the secret information as detailed in the subject FIR. As deposed in Para 3 of the Reply, she (petitioner) had managed to run away from the spot on seeing the police party. Further, in Para 7 therein, it has also been categorically mentioned that besides the present case, the petitioner is involved in one more case under the Act.

Keeping in view the above-discussed facts and circumstances

as well as the nature of the offence as alleged to have been committed by the petitioner, this Court is of the considered opinion that she (petitioner) does not deserve the relief of anticipatory bail.

Resultantly, the petition in hand stands dismissed.

January 27, 2022
Yag Dutt

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes*

Whether Reportable: *No*