

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215	CRM-M-8575-2024 Date of Decision:10.04.2024
SANJU	Petitioner
Vs.	
STATE OF PUNJAB	Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Mukesh Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner (through VC).
Mr. Baljinder Singh, DAG, Punjab.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.(ORAL)

On 26.02.2024, following order was passed:

“By way of present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.64 dated 22.11.2023 registered under Sections 473, 34 IPC and Section 61 of Punjab Excise Act, 1914 (Punjab Act No.1 of 1914) at Police Station Handesra, District SAS Nagar.

Allegations are that 206 boxes of liquor for sale in Chandigarh were found in vehicle bearing registration No.DL-1L-AL-1462 Mahendra Pick Up without any licence/permit. The vehicle was being driven by petitioner’s husband, who was apprehended at the spot. The only attribution to the petitioner is that she is the registered owner of the vehicle.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated simply because that her vehicle was being alleged used by her husband and that she has nothing to do with the alleged recovery.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on

behalf of the respondent- State. Copy of the petition be supplied to him during course of the day.

Adjourned to 10.04.2024 for filing status report.

In the meantime, in case of her arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/ Investigating Officer. However, it is further directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when so required by the Investigating Officer. She shall not contact any person associated with the case to dissuade her from the investigation in any manner whatsoever and nor shall leave the country without prior permission of the Court. She shall further comply with the conditions stipulated in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. ”

Today learned State counsel, on instructions submits that petitioner has since joined the investigation and is not required for custodial interrogation.

Having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstances, but without commenting anything further on the merits of the case order dated 26.02.2024 is hereby made absolute, whereby petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail.

However, the petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the Investigating Agency and shall abide by the conditions of Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

10.04.2024

pry

**(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/reasoned Yes/No
Whether Reportable Yes/No