



131

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-64647-2025
Decided on : 23.03.2026

Rajvir Singh alias Raju . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Sumeet Puri, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Rajvir Singh alias Raju, aged about 51 years	205	03.11.2025	61/1/14 of Punjab Excise Act	City Sangrur	Sangrur

2. In the present case, on 13.01.2026, following order was passed:-

- “1. Learned State counsel has filed reply by way of an affidavit of Sukhdev Singh PPS, dated 09.12.2025 in the Court today and the same is taken on record.
2. As per paragraph Nos.7 and 8 of the reply, on the basis of secret information, a raid was conducted at the house of petitioner. However, it is alleged that upon noticing the police party, petitioner managed to flee from the spot and could not be apprehended despite being chased by Constable Gagandeep Singh. Apart from the present case, petitioner is stated to be involved in total eleven cases, including nine cases under Section 61 of the Excise Act.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further argues that the alleged recovery of 25 bottles of country-made liquor has already been effected and, except of bald oral allegations, there is no cogent or connecting evidence to establish that the said recovery was effected from the house of the petitioner. It is submitted that neither any independent



witness was associated at the time of the alleged recovery, nor any videography was conducted to substantiate the prosecution version.

4. *Learned counsel further contends that all the other cases referred in the reply pertain to the period from 2017 to 2020 and thereafter, petitioner has been leading a simple and law-abiding life. It is argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case by the area police solely on the basis of his past antecedents.*

5. *Learned State counsel, however, seeks time to verify the factual assertions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, which do not find mention in the reply filed today.*

6. *List again on 19.01.2026.”*

3. Continuing the submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the recovery of 25 bottles of country-made liquor has already been effected. Moreover, in five of the cases, the petitioner has already been acquitted by the concerned Court. Thus, the authenticity of the allegations in the present FIR is doubtful, as it appears that the petitioner has been implicated once again in such like cases. Accordingly, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 09.12.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Learned State counsel submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender and, thus, he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail merely on the premise that the recovery of liquor has already been effected.

However, learned State counsel does not dispute the fact that the petitioner has already been acquitted in some of the cases.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

7. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, without commenting upon the merits, this Court is of the considered opinion



that the petitioner deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

8. Accordingly, petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

9. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

10. With the directions issued here above, **present petition stands disposed of.**

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 23, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*