



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

(105)

CRM-M-65665-2025

DATE OF DECISION: 05.02.2026

Veerpal Kaur @ Veero

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Nitish, Advocate,
for Mr. Kuldip Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr.Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioner in a case bearing FIR No.132 dated 06.10.2025, under Section 61(1) of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914, registered at Police Station Vairoke, District Fazilka.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case; she is a household lady; no independent witness was joined at the time of recovery and as the petitioner is ready to join the investigation, therefore, prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made.

3. On the other hand, Mr.Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, vehemently opposed the bail petition by filing a reply stating therein that a huge quantity of *lahan* (500 litres) has been recovered from the water tank placed on the top of the house of petitioner, and at the time of recovery, a videography has been carried out and same was also uploaded on E-sakshya. Excise Inspector also testified that same was *lahan* and made from chemical which



CRM-M-65665-2025

2

is injurious to health; present petitioner is required for custodial interrogation for proper investigation and collection of the evidence from where she collected the material for making the *lahan* recovered, and to uncover the nexus of its supply.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the allegations levelled against the petitioner that a huge quantity of *lahan* has been recovered from the house of petitioner; and at the time of recovery, a videography has been carried out as per the provisions of BNSS; petitioner is required for custodial interrogation to properly investigate the case and for collection of evidence; where the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to properly investigate the case and for collection of evidence, anticipatory bail cannot be granted to the petitioner in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as '***CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806***' ***decided on 03.08.1997***, wherein it has been held as under:-

"....custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favorable order under Section 438 of the code. In a case like this effective interrogation of suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful informations and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases.



CRM-M-65665-2025 3

The court has to presume that responsible Police Officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring would not conduct themselves as offenders.”

7. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.
8. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

05.02.2026	(SUBHAS MEHLA)
mamta	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No