

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

**CRM-M-44233-2018 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 14.01.2019**

**Satpal Singh @ Satta**

**...Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Haryana**

**...Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN**

Present:- Mr. R. S. Bains, Advocate  
for the applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana.

**ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)**

**CRM-1115-2019**

Allowed as prayed for.

Documents are taken on record as Annexure P-8 (*colly.*) and  
Annexure P-9.

**CRM-M-44233-2018**

This petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 94 dated 11.08.2017, registered under Sections 394/307/120-B/201/412 of the IPC and Section 25/54/59 of the Arms Act at Police Station Sector 20, Panchkula.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was taken in judicial custody on 05.10.2017 and on the same day, the son of the petitioner has filed CRWP No. 1186 of 2017 and when a Warrant Officer was appointed, it was found that the petitioner was involved in the

present FIR and the said criminal writ petition was disposed of accordingly.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that in the meantime, son of the petitioner was approached by one of the police officials for some illegal gratification, against which, son of the petitioner approached State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana and an FIR No. 08 dated 26.10.2017 was registered under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act against the Investigating Officer.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that after the arrest of the petitioner in the present FIR, petitioner has been nominated in nine other cases, some of which pertain to the year 2006 to 2009 and the petitioner has been granted bail in all the said cases.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that on account of registration of aforesaid FIR under the provisions of Prevention of Corruption Act against a police official, the petitioner is being repeatedly involved in old cases by showing his disclosure statement.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Rakesh Kumar, has not disputed the factual position.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Without commenting upon the merits of the case, considering the fact that the petitioner is in judicial custody since 05.10.2017 and also in view of the fact that trial is likely to take some time as the case is still at the stage of recording the statement of prosecution witnesses and out of total 27 prosecution witnesses, only 08 have been examined so far, the

instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

January 14, 2019

*Waseem Ansari*

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)

JUDGE

|                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Whether reportable</i>        | <i>Yes/No</i> |