

206

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

**CRM-M No. 26707 of 2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 15.01.2020**

Dr. Renu Bhatia

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Harchand Singh Batth, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.11 dated 17.05.2019, registered under Section 7 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Amendment Act, 2018) at Police Station Vigilance Bureau Range Amritsar, District Amritsar City.

At the time of issuance of notice of motion on 26.11.2019, following order was passed:

“Learned State counsel has filed reply on behalf of

the respondent-State and the same is taken on record.

Adjourned to 15.01.2020.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to surrender before the Arresting/Investigating Officer and join the investigation. On doing so, she shall be released on interim bail, subject to her furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/ Investigating Officer. However, she shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C. failing which she shall lose the benefit of interim bail allowed to her.”

Learned State counsel on instructions from Inspector Shamsher Singh opposed the anticipatory bail on the premise that there was a demand at the instance of petitioner that the amount of ₹10,000/- was to be paid to co-accused Iqbal Singh. In fact, the amount was paid in a trap laid by the prosecution, the recovery was also effected from Iqbal Singh.

Perusal of the prosecution version would show that infact the needful in the context of issuing attendance certificate had already been done by the petitioner about 10 days prior to lodging of FIR. The complainant was transferred on deputation from CHC Sheeto Guno, Fazilka to CHC Lopoke near Raja Sansi. In that context, the attendance certificate was issued by the petitioner much before lodging of the FIR, though the trap was laid qua petitioner as well but the petitioner was not found at the spot.

No recovery was effected from the petitioner at any point of time. The case appears to be debatable.

At this stage, without meaning anything on the merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to confirm the order dated 26.11.2019. However, petitioner shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

Petition stands disposed of.

15.01.2020

geeta

**(Raj Mohan Singh)
Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes / No
Yes / No