

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

CRM No.M-41832 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 04.05.2016

Sulakhan Singh and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. Amit Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. D.S. Virk, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. S.S. Sandhu, Advocate for CBI.

....

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. read with Section 482 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners for offences under Sections 13(1)(C), 13(1)(D) read with Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 which were added subsequently in case FIR No.23 dated 30.11.2011, under Sections 420/467/468/471/477-A IPC, registered at Police Station CBI, Chandigarh.

On 14.12.2015, while issuing notice of motion, the following order was passed by this Court:

“It is inter alia argued that all the petitioners namely Sulakhan Singh, Arpinder Singh Sehgal, Sukhwinder Singh, Mukhtiar Singh and Roshan Lal were allowed regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 14.12.2011 and that subsequently offence under Section 13 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 is now being sought to be added.

Notice of motion for 8th February, 2016.

Meanwhile, since the petitioners have already joined the investigations and have been sufficiently interrogated, they shall put in appearance before the trial Court within ten days from today and on their doing so they shall be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.”

Mr. S.S. Sandhu, learned counsel appearing for CBI states that he has received telephonic instructions from Mr. Ram Singh, Deputy Superintendent of Police that the petitioners are duly appearing on each and every date before the trial Court.

In view of the fact that the petitioners are associating with the trial proceedings, prayer made in the present petition is accepted.

The present petition is disposed of in terms of making the order dated 14.12.2015 as absolute.

It is made clear that in the eventuality of the petitioners absents from trial proceedings even on one solitary date, it would be open for the respondents to seek cancellation of the concession of anticipatory bail being granted to them.

Disposed of.

04.05.2016

harjeet

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**