



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-M-25359-2026

Date of Decision: 18.05.2026

BALJINDER SINGH @ BILLA

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. P.K.S. Phoolka, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Aakanksha Gupta, AAG, Punjab.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.82 dated 18.04.2026, under Sections 3 and 4 of Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956 and Sections 61, 1, 14 of Excise Act, registered at Police Station Kotwali, Bathinda District Bathinda.

2. The contents of FIR are reproduced hereinafter.

“Copy of Ruqa” Station House Officer, Jai Hind, today I INSP/SHO along with SI Amanpreet Singh 3680/PBI, ASI Harinder Singh No. 1155/Bathinda, Senior constable Gagandeep Singh 1869/Bathinda, Senior Constable Gaganpreet Singh 2145/Bathinda, Senior Constable Maninderjit Singh 1616/Bathinda, Lady Senior Constable Jaswinder Kaur No. 1002/Bathinda, PHG Gurjinder Singh 10320 and PHG Mandeep Singh 21972 in lieu of search and checking of suspected persons were present at the nearby Gol Diggi Bathinda. Then the informer gave secret information that on the second floor of Hotel Bahia Fort Bathinda, the owner of the hotel Baljinder Singh @ Billa, the girls working in the orchestra and dance bar are being presented to the customers on the pretext of a kitty party. These girls being forced to commit adultery on the pretext of a kitty party by persons namely Happy and Vicky. Liquor is being served in the hotel rooms without a license, in which this information is solid and reliable, and it is found that the hotel owner are Baljinder Singh @ Billa, Happy and Vikcy committed the offence under Section 3,4 Immoral Traffic, Prevention Act 1956 and 61/1/14 of Excise Act is being found.”



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of purported secret information received. It is submitted that neither was the petitioner present on the spot at the time of the alleged occurrence, nor has any incriminating material been recovered against him. It is submitted that the petitioner, who has been nominated as an accused due to party faction and personal enmity, is ready and willing to join investigation.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. Reply dated 13.05.2026 by way of affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division City-1, Bathinda, has been filed. Placing reliance on the same, it is submitted that on the basis of a secret information received, a raid following due procedure was carried out at the place of the alleged occurrence. Thereupon, it was found that in the guise of kitty parties, immoral activities were being carried out. Bottles of liquor being served, despite not having the license to do so, were found. Moreover, upon checking the rooms, multiple men were found to be present along with different girls, and other incriminating material was recovered. With respect to the role of the present petitioner, it is submitted that he being the owner of the said resort, where the alleged illegal activities had been taken place, is the main accused. It is further pointed out that besides the present FIR, there is another criminal case i.e. FIR No.164 dated 21.12.2024, under Sections 109, 61(2), 3(5) of BNS and Sections 3, 4, 5 of Immoral Trafficking (Prevention) Act, 1956 and under the Arms Act, registered against the petitioner. Accordingly, his



custodial interrogation is required to unearth the entire nexus and determine the true extent of the same.

5. Heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.
6. *Prima facie* grave and serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner, stated to be the owner of the premise in question, of facilitating and organizing the commission of offences under the IMTP Act, and also serving illicit liquor. The allegations are *prima facie* corroborated by way of material on record. Moreover, one other FIR under the similar offences has been registered against the petitioner. Therefore, having regard to the antecedents of the petitioner, the gravity and the societal impact of the alleged offences, and the likelihood that the custodial interrogation might be required for ascertaining the true extent of the alleged offences, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, since grant of such relief at this stage might prejudice a free, fair and effective investigation.
7. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.
8. Needless to say that nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.
9. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(KIRTI SINGH)

JUDGE

May 18, 2026

Nisha-1

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