



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

CRM-M No.7448 of 2024
Date of decision: 13th August, 2024

Karan Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep S. Chhina, Asst. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.49 dated 28.01.2024 under Sections 61-4-20 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 (Haryana Amendment Bill, 2020) and Section 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station City Narnaul, District Mahendergarh.

2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 09.05.2024, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation on the grounds of following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on 13.02.2024.

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the FIR in question annexed as Annexure P-2 is completely silent qua the involvement of the petitioner in the crime in question; the petitioner came to be nominated as an accused on the basis of a disclosure statement



allegedly suffered by co-accused Rohin who stated that the recovered liquor had been purchased from the shop of the petitioner. It has been asserted by the learned counsel that the petitioner is a licence holder and has been running licensed liquor vends in the area of Narnaul.

On a pointed query put to the learned counsel qua his antecedents, he has submitted that no doubt there are a few criminal cases registered against him, however, in one of those six cases he stands acquitted, while in another case the proceedings have been stayed by this Court and as far as the remaining four cases are concerned they have been registered against the petitioner at the same police station on the same date from which it is discernible that he is being sought to be falsely implicated in the criminal cases by the police.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 09.05.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

5. In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 09.05.2024 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid



CRM-M No.7448 of 2024

down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./Section 482(2) BNSS. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted to him.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

August 13, 2024
rps

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