



CRM-M-18264-2024

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

CRM-M-18264-2024
Decided on : 23.07.2024

Puneet Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Mukesh Kumar Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, AAG, Haryana.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

1. This is the petition filed by the petitioner seeking concession of regular bail in case FIR No.410 dated 09.11.2023 under Sections 188, 201, 272, 308, 328, 420, 467, 468, 471, 472, 473 and 120-B IPC and 61, 63-A of Excise Act registered at Police Station Mullana District Ambala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the only role attributed to the petitioner in the crime in question is that he helped his cousin brother Uttam i.e. co-accused in renting out the premises to co-accused Ankit and Kapil Pandit, where then both these co-accused were manufacturing illicit and spurious liquor. It has been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that even as per the projected case of the prosecution, there is no allegation



CRM-M-18264-2024

levelled against him of having in any manner contributed towards the manufacture of spurious liquor, much less of providing the co-accused necessary ingredients for the same. Further, there is no other material to connect the petitioner with the manufacture of spurious liquor apart from the fact that he had signed as a witness to the rent agreement qua the premises. It has further been submitted that after the petitioner was arrested on 16.11.2023, the investigation had been completed and even challan presented and hence, in the circumstances and keeping in view the role attributed to the petitioner, his further incarceration would serve no useful purpose, more so, when as many as 53 prosecution witnesses had been cited and the next date fixed before the trial Court is 20.09.2024 when charges were likely to be framed.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, has not been able to dispute the role attributed to the petitioner in the crime in question i.e. of only being a signatory to the rent agreement and of having helped his cousin brother Uttam in renting out his premises to co-accused Ankit and Kapil Pandit. Learned State counsel has also not disputed that the investigation in the present case is complete qua the petitioner and the next date of hearing fixed before the trial Court is 20.09.2024.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused



CRM-M-18264-2024

the material placed on record.

5. The petitioner has been in custody since 16.11.2023. The investigation in the case in hand is complete as challan stands presented. The trial has not progressed as charges are yet to be framed.

6. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove and the role attributed to the petitioner in the crime in question, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

23.07.2024
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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