



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

302

CRM-M-52597-2025

BOOTA SINGH

...PETITIONER

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

Date of decision: 26.11.2025

Date of uploading:26.11.2025

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Rahul Rana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Gurcharan S. Rai, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.94 dated 19.08.2025, registered under Sections 61/1/14 of Excise Act at Police Station Bareta, District Mansa.

2. On 25.09.2025, the following order was passed:-

“Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.94 dated 19.08.2025, registered under Sections 61/1/14 of Excise Act at Police Station Bareta, District Mansa.

Upon notice, Mr. G.S. Dhaliwal, AAG, Punjab has appeared and accepts notice on behalf of the State. Both the parties have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused.

In compliance of order dated 18.09.2025, status report by way of an affidavit of Sikander Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Budhlada, District Mansa, filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.

As per prosecution case, a secret information was received that Boota Singh (petitioner) and Tarsem Singh indulge in the illicit



distillation of liquor in the house owned by Boota Singh. Thereafter, a raid was conducted where two persons were seen sitting near working still. On seeing the police party, one person fled away. However, constable Gursewak Singh identified him to be Boota Singh while co-accused Tarsem Singh was apprehended at the spot. 30 litre of lahan and 360 ml of illicit liquor was recovered from the spot.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He was never present at the spot and co-accused Tarsem Singh, who was present at the spot was apprehended and recovery has already been effected. Co-accused Tarsem Singh has already been released on regular bail. Learned counsel contended that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that in view of the gravity of offence, petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Adjourned to 26.11.2025.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.]:-

- i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
- iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court;*
- iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of Section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.”*

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 25.09.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

4. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand; especially the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated therein and is no longer required by the State for further custodial interrogation, this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated

25.09.2025, granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

5. Ordered accordingly.
6. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.
7. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
8. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.
9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

26.11.2025
jatin

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