



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

114

CRM-M-14723-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 17.03.2026

Jai Bhagwan @ Jaibhagwan ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Kotla, 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.0409 dated 22.12.2025, registered under Section 61(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2) and 238 of BNS and Section 61 of Excise Act, at Police Station Murthal (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 upon instructions from ASI Krishan Kumar opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, inasmuch as he is alleged to have supplied forged and fabricated documents for operating a liquor smuggling racket. It is further contended that 341 forged bills were recovered from the mobile phone of Ravi, and the petitioner allegedly received ₹12,000 per bill. It is further submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for a proper investigation, collection of evidence, and to ascertain the modus operandi adopted by the accused in running the racket. Learned State counsel also submitted that the forged bills were purported to be for rice and other goods, whereas, in reality, 1,090 boxes of liquor were being transported in the vehicle.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel, and considering the allegations against the petitioner that he prepared forged and fabricated documents to assist the co-accused in operating a smuggling racket wherein liquor was transported under the camouflage of other goods; and further taking into account the version that he charged ₹12,000 per bill, with as many as 341 such forged bills having been detected from the mobile phone of the co-accused; hence, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for a proper investigation, collection of evidence, and to ascertain the modus operandi adopted by the accused in running the racket. In view of the above



CRM-M-14723-2026 (O&M) (3)

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.

17.03.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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