



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-M-13274-2025
Date of decision: 13.05.2025

SANEEP SINGH @ MOOLI
....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA
...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Sanjeev Kodan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH. J.(Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Saneep Singh @ Mooli, aged about 46 years	186	28.08.2024	61(1)(a)-4-20 of Excise Act, and Section 61(2) of BNS, 2023	Haryana State Enforcement Bureau	Jhajjar

2. Status report dated 12.05.2025 by way of an affidavit of Virender Singh, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Haryana State Enforcement Bureau, Rohtak has been filed on behalf of respondent-State. The same is taken on record.



3. On 10.03.2025, following order was passed:-

“1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Saneep Singh @ Mooli, aged about 46 years	186	28.08.2024	61(1)(a)-4-20 of Excise Act, and Section 61(2) of BNS, 2023	Haryana State Enforcement Bureau	Jhajjar

2. *Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the order dismissing the anticipatory bail application filed by the petitioner, passed by the Court of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jhajjar, is perverse. The order wrongly declined the relief of anticipatory bail by relying on an incorrect fact—that upon reaching the spot, the raiding team apprehended one person named Saneep @ Mooli, whereas the actual name was Dharmender, which was also mentioned in the secret information.*

3. *Counsel for the petitioner further contends that the secret information does not mention the petitioner’s name, nor was he present at the spot. The petitioner’s involvement is only established on the basis that, in the past, the police had allegedly framed the petitioner in four similar cases. A disclosure statement was recorded from the main accused, Dharmender, who then implicated the petitioner as a co-accused, alleging that he had purchased illicit liquor from him.*

However, there is no other connecting evidence with the prosecution, establishing any relation of him with main accused or with the recovered liquor.

He also submits that the petitioner is willing to join the



- 3-

investigation, provided this Court grants protection from arrest.

4. *Notice of motion.*

5. *On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.*

6. *Adjourned to 13.05.2025.*

7. *In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).*

8. *Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.*

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 10.03.2025, passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated.

5. Learned State counsel on instructions from the Investigating Officer, confirms the said averment and submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would not be required now for the purpose of investigation.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

7. Since the petitioner has joined the investigation, custodial interrogation is no more required, present petition is allowed and ad-interim order dated 10.03.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute.

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under



Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

8. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

13.05.2025
amandeep

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No