

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

CRM-M No.8925 of 2016

Date of Decision:-14.03.2016

Mandeep Singh, IAS (Retd.).

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- Mr. Karanvir Singh Khehar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

JASWANT SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Prayer is under Section 438 Cr.PC for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner-Mandeep Singh in case FIR No.12 dated 26.08.2015 for offences punishable under Sections 13(1)(e) read with Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 read with Section 120-B of Indian Penal Code registered with Police Station Vigilance Bureau, Phase-1, Punjab at Mohali.

FIR has been registered by the Vigilance Bureau after an enquiry conducted against the present petitioner-accused Mandeep Singh and co-accused Makhan Singh and Avtar Singh by fixing a check period from 1.4.1998 to 31.03.2014 regarding the income and expenditure of the petitioner-accused Mandeep Singh and his family members and that of the co-accused Makhan Singh. It was found that the petitioner-accused and his family members was 57.50 more than their known sources of income. It was also found that the co-accused Makhan Singh was used a front by petitioner-accused Mandeep Singh for purchasing and selling the properties in the name of his family members by using the money collected through

corruption. The petitioner-accused has also used co-accused in spending his ill-gotten wealth in the construction of the hotel Mark Royal Ashiana etc.

It was contended that the petitioner is a retired bureaucrat with more than 30 years of unblemished service and by joining the investigation he has already explained sources of income for his properties I.e. H.No.747-A, Sector 8-B, Chandigarh, H.No.1584, Sector 33-D, Chandigarh and SCO No.9-10, Sector 20-C, Chandigarh in his name and the rest of the properties under the ownership of his family members, which has been purchased from the incomes generated from their sources and including inheritance.

After hearing learned Counsel for the petitioner, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out keeping in view the nature and gravity of the alleged offences. Learned trial Court while declining the similar relief has noticed that in the inquiry it has been found that the expenditure of the petitioner has been almost Rs.3 crores more than his actual and disclosed income and has acquired disproportionate assets by corrupt methods. He being the main accused is required for custodial interrogation to have a fair and proper investigation to unearth the *modus operandi* and the role of the other co-accused.

In view of the above, finding no merit in the present petition seeking anticipatory bail, the same is hereby dismissed.

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

March 14, 2016
Vinay