

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

207

**CRM-M No.37286 of 2019
Date of Decision: 19.2.2020**

AMRINDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

Vs

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr.Gautam Dutt, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.J.S.Ghumman, DAG, Punjab.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 209 dated 11.8.2019 registered under Sections 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act and Sections 409, 120-B IPC at Police Station Sadar, Tarn Taran District Tarn Taran.

Vide order dated 14.11.2019, petitioner was directed to surrender before the Investigating Officer and join the investigation. On doing so he was ordered to be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing requisite bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. Thereafter, interim order was extended vide order dated 5.12.2019 and the petitioner was again directed to appear before the Investigating Officer and join the investigation. Similar situation existed even on 19.12.2019.

Today also learned State counsel, on instructions

from SI Sandeep Kaur, states that the petitioner needs to be joined again for further investigation.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner was never privy to any alleged transaction. Petitioner was given charge to take care of technical aspect of the administration of computer system installed in the office of Deputy Commissioner. Petitioner is qualified upto B.Tech and is holding the post of District Technical Coordinator (DTC). Contract of renewing the Arms License in the office of Deputy Commissioner was given to the private company known as BLS and the said company was responsible for looking after the aspect of checking of all documents for the purposes of getting the same renewed after getting renewal fee to be deposited in the Treasury. Petitioner being a technical hand, has nothing to do with the receipt or deposit of renewal fee as he was only required to act as technical link between the administration and District Portal. In the event of occurring any technical error. It was the duty of the petitioner to remove the same and bring the same to the notice of the department of e-governance reforms. Petitioner was only responsible to maintain the coordination and to inform the status of work to the higher authority. The revenue collection was to be deposited by the service operator only.

The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner appears to be debatable.

In view of above, interim order dated 14.11.2019 is made absolute. However, the petitioner shall keep on joining the investigation as and when required to do so and he shall abide by the following conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C:-

(i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation before the Investigating Officer as and when required;

(ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) that the petitioner shall not leave the country, without prior permission of the Court and shall surrender his passport, if any.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

February 19, 2020

anita

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No