

**CRM-M-7633-2025**

204

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

CRM-M-7633-2025

Date of Decision: 01.08.2025

Sikander Singh @ Bittu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. S.S. Duhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, A.A.G., Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
209	21.08.2020	Sadar Sri Muktsar Sahib	61/1/14 of Punjab Excise Act

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.

2. Per paragraph 7 of the reply filed by State counsel, the petitioner has the following criminal antecedent:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Dated	Offence	Police Station
1.	09	15.03.2024	61/1/14 of Excise Act	Lakhewali

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the reply filed by State counsel, which reads as follows:

“3. That the brief facts of the case are that instant FIR has been registered against Petitioner on the basis of secret information will the allegations of his being indulge in distilling illicit liquor and selling to the others. The investigation into matter led to the recovery of 20-1/4 bottles of illicit liquor from the possession of present petitioner, which was taken into possession vide seizure memo. The present petitioner was arrested in accordance with Law. The petitioner was released on regular bail vide order dated 24-08-2020 passed by the Ld. Magistrate.”

**CRM-M-7633-2025**

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and his family.
5. The State's counsel opposes bail.
6. The petitioner was earlier on bail; however, he failed to appear, which led to the cancellation of the bail and he was declared proclaimed offender on 18.11.2024.
7. Counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to order dated 11.02.2025 passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, the petitioner has already joined the proceedings before the trial Court and continuously appearing on all dates of hearing.
8. The petitioner was granted interim protection, and during the interregnum, there is no allegation that he had intimidated the witnesses, did not appear before the investigator. Given the above, there would be no justification to discontinue the interim protection, which is made absolute.
9. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.
10. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.
11. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. Interim order dated 11.02.2025 is made absolute. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

01.08.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.