



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-13174 of 2026

Date of Decision: 20.03.2026

Bhavneesh Kumar

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Mr. Gautam Dutt, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Saurabh Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana, for the respondent.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. This petition for pre-arrest bail is the first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No. 407 dated 10.12.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Section 61 of 'the Punjab Excise Act, 1914' and Section 318(4) [Section(s) 338, 336(3), 340(2), 238, 253 and 61(2) added later on] of 'the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023'.

2. Vide order dated 11.03.2026, the petitioner was admitted to interim anticipatory bail, subject to the condition of furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. It was also directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation.

contended that in compliance with the order dated 13.03.2026 the petitioner has joined investigation. In view of above-mentioned submission learned counsel for the petitioner has requested that the order dated 11.03.2026, whereby interim anticipatory bail was accorded to the petitioner, be made absolute.

4. In response to above-mentioned submissions, the learned State counsel has submitted that although the petitioner has joined the investigation, but he has been non-cooperative, and that the source from where he procured the liquor has not been disclosed.

5. The record has been perused carefully.

6. A careful perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are necessary to be taken into consideration for a decision:-

- i) that the offence is triable by the court of Judicial Magistrate;
- ii) that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- iii) that there is nothing on record to show that custodial interrogation of the petitioner will serve any purpose;
- iv) that the investigation and trial of the case are not likely to be concluded in near future;
- v) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on anticipatory bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and

- vi) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on anticipatory bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the trial.
7. In view of above, the present petition is hereby **allowed**, and the order dated 11.03.2026, whereby the petitioner was accorded the benefit of interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

March 20, 2026
“DK”

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