



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

111

CRM-M-15809-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 23.03.2026

Varinder Kumar Kaler @ Tony	...	Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Punjab	...	Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Namish Sodhi, 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.49 dated 20.02.2026, registered under Sections 61/1/14 of Punjab Excise Act, 1914, at Police Station Phillaur, District Jalandhar.
2. Brief facts of the case are that upon receiving a secret information that the present petitioner indulged in sale of illicit liquor, a 'Naka' was held and vehicle bearing No.PB-37-J-2054 was seen coming which was signaled to stop, however, after stopping the vehicle, present petitioner fled away from the spot and 60 bottles of liquor were recovered from the said car, which were for sale in Chandigarh only, however, present recovery was made from District Jalandhar.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submitted that no recovery was effected from the possession of the present petitioner and alleged recovery has been planted only to harass him. Thus, 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. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that upon secret information, petitioner was intercepted and illicit liquor was recovered from the vehicle which belongs to the present petitioner; 05 cartons of illicit liquor were recovered (60 bottles of Whiskey) as same were meant for sale in U.T. Chandigarh only. He further contended that the petitioner does not have clean antecedents and is involved in 11 other cases out of which 3 cases are under Section 307 of IPC. Therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for proper investigation of the present case and for collection of evidence, and there is an apprehension that petitioner may evade the process of law or will not co-operate with Investigating Agency.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the contentions of learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel that there are sufficient evidence pointing towards the complicity of the present petitioner in the commission of alleged offence as he was intercepted upon secret information; 60 bottles of illicit liquor have been recovered from the vehicle which belongs to the present petitioner; further the illicit liquor recovered was not meant for sale in Punjab but only for sale in U.T., Chandigarh; the petitioner does not have clean antecedents and is involved in 11 other cases, and furthermore,



CRM-M-15809-2026 (O&M) (3)

custodial interrogation of the petitioner is considered necessary for proper investigation of the present case and for collection of evidence. 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.

23.03.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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