

2025:PHHC:118951



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

226

**CRM-M No.20121 of 2025  
Date of Decision: 02.09.2025**

Shekhar

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. Sandeep Singh Jattan, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,  
for the respondent-State.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)**

1. The instant one is the second petition as filed by the petitioner for grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.410 dated 09.11.2023 registered under Sections 188, 201, 272, 308, 328, 120-B, 420, 467, 468, 471, 472, 473 and 34 of IPC and Sections 61, 63-A and 72-A of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 (Haryana Amendment Bill, 2020) at Police Station Mullana, District Ambala. His previous petition bearing CRM-M No.28108 of 2024 had been dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 21.08.2024.

2025:PHHC:118951



2. As per the allegations, on 09.11.2023, on receipt of secret information by the complainant SI Karam Chand to the effect that the accused Kapil Pandit and Ankit @ Mogli along with other accomplices were involved in manufacturing fake/spurious countrymade liquor in the premises of an old factory existing in the area of Village Dhanaura, District Ambala. It was also informed that if raid was conducted, they could be apprehended while manufacturing illicit liquor. Believing the secret information to be true, a raiding party was immediately formed which reached at the informed place and recovered some burnt empty liquor bottles, six bottles of fake liquor, wrappers having written "Taaza Malta", one electric machine of liquor making and several big as well as small plastic drums and one drum having fevicol and 90 empty plastic bottles. All these articles were taken into custody. The aforementioned FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. The accused Uttam Singh and Puneet were arrested on the same day. They were interrogated and suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the crime. On the basis of their statements, the present petitioner and co-accused Parveen were nominated as such. They were arrested on 10.11.2023. They suffered disclosure statements to the effect that they were employed by the co-accused for making illicit liquor. Subsequently, other co-accused were also arrested. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the secret information or in the FIR. He was merely an employee in the factory and

2025:PHHC:118951



used to affix labels and corks on the bottles. He was not aware about the lethal nature of chemicals used in the factory or that the factory owners had any valid license or not. He has worked only for five days in the month of November 2023 in the factory. Now he is in custody since 10.11.2023. There is no material qua his complicity in the crime. The co-accused Prince Walia, Uttam Singh, Anshul Garg, Puneet and Ravinder Pal Singh have been extended benefit of bail. The co-accused Sourabh and Parveen Kumar whose case is on similar footing have also been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Per contra, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana while opposing the submissions made by petitioner's counsel has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. He along with the co-accused was involved in manufacturing spurious/illicit liquor. Due to spurious liquor manufactured in the factory of the accused Kapil Pandit, Ankit @ Mogli and their accomplices as many as 20 persons have died. Some other FIRs have also been registered in this regard. It is, however, not controverted that the petitioner was an employee in the chemical factory set up by the co-accused Kapil Pandit and Ankit @ Mogli. The petitioner is a habitual offender as he is involved in four other cases. There are chances of his absconding or intimidating the witnesses if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner is in custody since 10.11.2023. There is no

2025:PHHC:118951



possibility of the trial being concluded without taking considerable time since most of the witnesses are to be examined. The petitioner is not a prime accused in the case. He is shown to be involved in four other cases. However, that cannot be considered to be the prime reason for denying benefit of bail to the petitioner. Most of the co-accused have been extended benefit of bail. In view of the circumstances as enumerated above, this Court considers it proper to extend concession of bail to the petitioner as his further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose.

7. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**02.09.2025**

manju

**(MANISHA BATRA)  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No