



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

111

CRM-M-66024-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 11.03.2026

Rulia Ram

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. S.K. Sirsa, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This first petition has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No. 187 dated 15.09.2025 for offence(s) under Section 61 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 registered at Police Station Kotwali Patiala, District Patiala.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, the police party, while on patrolling duty on 15.09.2025, saw a man coming from the front, carrying a white plastic bag on his right shoulder. When the police party turned towards Tejbagh Colony, Patiala, the man started walking fast and took a sharp turn towards Bhoothnath Temple. Suspecting him of possessing a contraband, the police officials stopped him and the man disclosed his name as Ravi son of Chandrabhan resident of Talab Rori Kutt Mohalla, Sanori Adda, District Patiala. He could not give any explanation about the contents of the bag that

he was carrying and whereupon, the said bag was opened. Sealed bottles of country-made liquor brand “Club” for sale in Haryana only, were recovered. Since, the recovered liquor was in violation of the provisions of the Punjab Excise Act, hence, the instant FIR has been registered.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the name of the petitioner cropped up in the disclosure of the said accused/Ravi to the effect that he alongwith the petitioner used to purchase the country-made liquor from Haryana at cheaper prices and sell it in Punjab at higher prices. He contends that the entire recovery has already been effected and that even the source of purchase of the bottles is already known and no recovery of any nature whatsoever is to be effected from the petitioner, hence, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required in the present case.

4. Learned State counsel does not dispute that the entire excisable material (country-made liquor) already stands seized and there is no balance recovery to be effected from the petitioner and also that the name of the petitioner cropped up on the disclosure of the co-accused Ravi. He, however, contends that the petitioner has earlier cases under the Punjab Excise Act as well.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the respective parties and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as noted above, including the fact that name of the petitioner cropped up on the disclosure of co-accused/Ravi and the entire recovery has already been effected from the said co-accused, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to

advance any interest of justice.

6. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer and join the investigation as and when required to do so, whereupon the petitioner shall be released on anticipatory bail to the satisfaction of Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer, subject to the conditions as specified under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) of 2023.

7. It is made clear that in pursuance to and in compliance with this order, the petitioner does not cooperate with the investigating agency, the investigating agency would be at liberty to move an appropriate application for cancellation of bail.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

11.03.2026

Mangal Singh

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