

227 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-50335-2019

Date of decision: December 03, 2019

Devi DayalPetitioner
Versus
State of PunjabRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. D.K. Bhatti, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jagmohan Ghumman, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the present petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.1496 dated 31.10.2019, registered under Sections 136/138 of the Electricity Act, 2003 at Police Station Anti Power Theft, District Jalandhar.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the allegations in the FIR, registered at the instance of Additional Executive Engineer Enforcement Wing-I, Jalandhar, he received a secret information that some persons, in connivance with the consumers, are tampering with the meters in Jalandhar City at a large scale. One person, namely, Devi Dayal, i.e. the petitioner is also involved in the same. On making a phone call, the petitioner gave his consent for tampering the meter and demanded Rs.7,000/- for doing the work. The deal was fixed for Rs.5,000/- and Rs.2,000/- was paid to the petitioner in advance by one Junior Engineer. Again, there was a telephonic conversation between them and

on the next day, two boys reached at the given place and by opening the meter-box, started tampering with the same. In the meantime, a raiding party of the Anti Power Theft Staff apprehended them along with the kit.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a shopkeeper and has been falsely implicated. He further submits that the petitioner has not committed any offence.

In reply, learned Stated counsel, on instructions from Inspector Ramandeep Singh, assisted by Mr. Parminder Singh, counsel for the complainant has opposed the prayer on the ground that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required as the allegations are that there are several such instances of tampering of the meter. Learned State counsel has also submitted that even another FIR of a similar nature has also been registered against the petitioner.

After hearing counsel for the parties and looking into the serious allegations against the petitioner, no ground for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out.

The petitions is, accordingly, dismissed.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

December 03, 2019
satish

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No