

2024:PHHC:074656



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

CRM-M-26620 of 2024

Date of Decision: 24.05.2024

Dinesh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Ketan Antil, Advocate for the petitioner.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (Oral)

By way of present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.150 dated 27.04.2024 registered under Section 61 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 (Haryana Amendment Bill, 2020) at Police Station Sector-27, Sonipat, District Sonipat, Haryana.

As per prosecution allegations, on 27.04.2024, secret information was received by the Police to the effect that co-accused Vikrant, Vikash, Ankit and Sant Kumar alias Dhillu were doing the business of selling illicit liquor for Sonu son of Karambir Singh, resident of Luhlara and at that time, they had loaded the liquor in Vehicle No.DL3CBE3460 Marka Honda Amaze; and Vehicle No.DL7CT0617 Marka Ford Figo, for loading the same in other vehicles bearing registration No.HR10AP9746 Marka Mahindra Thar and DL10CF1725 Marka Honda Jazz, for transporting the same to Delhi. Raid was conducted at the disclosed place. Two young boys ran away inside the basement of the Society. They were apprehended. Two vehicles No.DL3CBE3460 Marka Honda Amaze and DL7CT0617 Marka Ford Figo were apprehended. The apprehended boys disclosed their names as Vikrant and Vikash. The two vehicles were found to be loaded with total 75 boxes of liquor. On their disclosure statement, they also



disclosed that they were taking liquor to Delhi for sale on the asking of Sonu son of Karambir.

It is contended by learned counsel that the petitioner has been falsely implicated; that he was not present at the place of occurrence; nor is named in the statement made to the Police by the co-accused Vikrant and Vikash; that he has no concern with any of the vehicles from which the liquor was recovered and that petitioner is ready to join the investigation.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Ram Kumar Singla, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent- State.

Learned State Counsel has opposed the bail petition by pointing out that petitioner is the king-pin of the gang running the trade of illicit liquor and he is specifically named in the FIR by the name of Sonu.

On query from learned counsel for the petitioner, it is conceded by learned counsel that petitioner – Dinesh is known by the name of Sonu.

However, perusal of the paper book would reveal that this fact is not disclosed by the petitioner that he is known by the name of Sonu as named in the FIR.

Having regard to the above circumstances and also the nature of allegations against the petitioner and the gravity of the offence, this Court does not find the present case to be fit for grant of anticipatory bail as custodial



interrogation of the petitioner may be required so as to know the origin of the liquor as recovered from the co-accused.

Dismissed.

May 24, 2024
renu

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

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