



In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh

114

CRM-M-13698-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 12.03.2026

Satish Kumar @ Lala	Versus	... Petitioner
State of Haryana		... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Sanjeev Kadian, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 (438 of Cr.P.C.), has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.41 dated 23.02.2026, registered under Section 61 of Punjab Excise Act, 1914, at Police Station Sector 27, District Sonipat.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case only on the basis of the disclosure statement of a co-accused, which is inadmissible in evidence. It is further contended that apart from the said disclosure statement, there is no material on record connecting the petitioner with the commission of the alleged offence. Accordingly, learned counsel prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, submitting that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation.
3. Notice of motion.
4. Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposed the prayer made by learned counsel



CRM-M-13698-2026 (O&M)

(2)

for the petitioner by submitting that a huge quantity of illicit liquor has been recovered from two vehicles; 46 cartons of country made liquor were recovered along with 67 cartons of liquor (37 of 'Empire 1' brand, and 30 of 'All Seasons' brand) and same were meant for sale in U.T. Chandigarh only; but said recovery was made in Sonapat. The driver only 1 vehicle could be apprehended i.e. co-accused Parmod, who disclosed that the recovered liquor belonged to the present petitioner. It was further contended that the vehicle in question is also a product of fraud, as the instalments of the vehicle were not paid to the company and the vehicle was subsequently sold repeatedly. He further contended that the petitioner does not have clean antecedents and is involved in other cases of a similar nature. Therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for proper investigation of the present case and to ascertain the source of the illicit liquor as well as the vehicle used in the commission of the crime.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the contentions of learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and considering the allegations against the petitioner that he is alleged to be involved in the sale of illicit liquor which was not meant for sale in Haryana but only for sale in U.T., Chandigarh; a huge quantity of illicit liquor has been recovered, and the co-accused has nominated the present petitioner as the owner of the said illicit liquor; the petitioner does not have clean antecedents and is involved in other cases of a similar nature, and furthermore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is considered necessary for proper investigation of the present case and to ascertain the source of the illicit liquor as well as the details as to



CRM-M-13698-2026 (O&M) (3)

vehicle involved in the commission of the crime and to trace the complete chain of events and modus operandi of accused. In view of the above circumstances, this Court is not inclined to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The Hon’ble Supreme Court has emphasised the importance of custodial interrogation in case titled as ‘**CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806’ decided on 03.08.1997**, by holding that many useful informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

8. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands **dismissed**.

9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

12.03.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No