

211

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

**CRM-M No.50521 of 2019
Date of Decision: 17.02.2020**

Ramesh Kumar

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr. Vikas Bishnoi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anmol Malik, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Jitender Malik, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

Petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.09 dated 01.07.2019 registered under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act (during investigation, Section 7(A) of the Prevention of Corruption Act and Section 180 IPC were added) at Police Station State Vigilance Bureau Hisar.

The FIR came to be registered at the instance of the complainant Rajesh Kumar who along with Ishwar were

employed as Home Guard Volunteers. Home Guard Volunteers were discharged on 30.06.2019. One Constable in Home Guard namely Sharwan Kumar told the complainant that he had a talk with Platoon Commander who had assured him that the volunteers will again be accommodated and be given their duties. According to Sharwan Kumar, he was asked to take Rs.14,000/- per Constable and in such eventuality, volunteers will be given their duties.

A trap was laid and co-accused Sharwan Kumar was arrested. Thereafter, co-accused Sharwan Kumar has been enlarged on regular bail by the Additional Sessions Judge/Special Judge vide order dated 06.09.2019.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the enrollment of the volunteers was stopped in the year 2016 by the Director and the said fact was known to all.

Learned State counsel duly assisted by learned counsel for the complainant on instructions from Inspector Gurmeet Singh states that the challan has been presented qua the petitioner. The date of arrest of the petitioner is also not in dispute. The petitioner is in custody since 02.09.2019.

The alleged recovery of Rs.5000/- from the petitioner would remain debatable whether the said amount was tainted

money or not.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and without meaning anything on merits of the case, it would be just and appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail. Let the petitioner be enlarged on regular bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

17.02.2020

Prince

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No