



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

(108)

CRM-M-73496-2025

DATE OF DECISION: 05.02.2026

Baljeet Singh

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Arkash Mani Garg, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr.Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.187 dated 16.10.2025, under Sections 61 of Excise Act (Sections 336(2) and 336(3) BNS added later on), registered at Police Station City Dhuri, District Sangrur, Punjab.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that he was involved in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, which is not admissible in evidence against him and relied upon copies of orders passed by Co-ordinate Bench passed in CRM-M-65714-2025 titled as Naveen Kumar vs. State of Haryana, dated 19.12.2025, CRM-M-52597-2025 titled Boota Singh v. State of Punjab, dated 26.11.2025 and in CRM-M-55992-2025 titled Varinderjit Singh vs. State of Punjab, dated 22.12.2025.

3. On the other hand, Mr.Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, appeared and filed reply, which is taken on record, and opposed the bail petition by submitting that it is a racket in which present petitioner is actively involved



CRM-M-73496-2025

2

and allegation is that forged and fabricated label and QR codes and spurious liquor was recovered from the co-accused; present petitioner is not having clean and clear antecedents as he is involved in similar case vide FIR No.36 dated 10.06.2024, under Section 61/78 of Excise Act, registered at Police Station Thulliwal, District Barnala and is also required for custodial interrogation for proper investigation and collection of the evidence.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the allegations against him that from the co-accused namely Dara Singh, 24 bottles were recovered and as per report of the Excise Department that the hologram and labels are fake and fictitious and a gang is working for the supply of spurious liquor; present petitioner is a member of that gang and he is required for custodial interrogation for proper investigation; where the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to properly investigate the case and for collection of evidence.

6. 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.

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



CRM-M-73496-2025 3

learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits,
strictly in accordance with law.

05.02.2026
mamta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No