

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

CRM-M-5451-2016

Date of Decision: September 01, 2016

Jeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI

Present: Mr. Inderjit Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jashanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rohit Kumar, Advocate,
for the complainant.

.....

M.M.S. BEDI, J (Oral)

The petitioner seeks the concession of pre-arrest bail in a case registered at the instance of Sukhjinder Singh alleging that the complainant, along with Lovedeep, Jagmit, Gagandeep and one another person, was accused in a case FIR No. 188 under Sections 323, 428, 452, 148, 149 IPC, in which a Swift Car was also involved.

The complainant along with Lovedeep had approached the petitioner for declaring Lovedeep innocent and for release of the Swift Car. The petitioner in the capacity as SHO along with his Reader Satrup Singh @ Laddi demanded a sum of Rs.50,000/- from the complainant for declaring Lovedeep innocent and for releasing his car. On a raid having been conducted, the Reader of the petitioner was caught red-handed with a sum of Rs.50,000/-, paid by the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the complainant is involved in the three different case registered at Police Station Dharamgarh, District Sangrur, Police Station Kotwali, District Bathinda, and FIR No. 188, in which his Car is also involved. He has further argued that the petitioner is not the investigating officer of the case and no recovery is to be effected in this case.

The petition has been opposed by learned counsel for the complainant, inter-alia, on the ground that there is a telephonic conversation between the petitioner and the complainant. The transcript of the said conversation has been placed on record.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant and gone through the police record. Merely because petitioner is not the investigating officer, he cannot be presumed to have no connection with the case registered at Police Station under his jurisdiction. The

recovery from the Reader of the petitioner and the telephonic conversation are prima facie indicative of his culpability in the corruption case. No extraordinary exceptionable circumstances exist to grant the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

The petition is dismissed.

Nothing said in this order will be deemed to be an expression of opinion on merits of the case and will not debar the petitioner to seek the concession of regular bail in accordance with law.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

September 01, 2016
apurva

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No