

217

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

**CRM-M No.54352 of 2019
Date of Decision: 31.01.2020**

Zile Singh @ Zile Singh Yadav

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Raj Kapoor Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anmol Malik, AAG, Haryana.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

Petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.014 dated 14.08.2019 registered under Sections 7, 8 of Prevention of Corruption Act, at Police station State Vigilance Bureau, Karnal, District Karnal.

After the alleged demand, a trap was laid resulting in arrest of Yashpal Sangwan who is alleged to be tout of the petitioner. Yashpal Sangwan was caught red handed and he is in custody. Petitioner is an Assistant Secretary with the office of RTA. Allegations are that he used to harass the complainant by

demanding bribe in lieu of grant of permission to ply the bus on the said route. Allegations are that the complainant party visited the RTA office number of times to deposit the amount of fine, but the petitioner did not receive the same and raised a demand of Rs.50,000/- as a bribe.

Learned counsel for the petitioner also points out that while filing the challan, Section 7-A of the Prevention of Corruption Act and Section 201 IPC have also been added.

It would be arguable whether as against fine of Rs.4000/-, demand of Rs.50,000/- can be made or not and even if demand is accepted, who would pay the aforesaid amount, particularly when the alleged violation could have been compounded against the fine of Rs.4000/-. Nothing has been recovered from the petitioner. Petitioner is in custody since 09.11.2019.

Learned State counsel on instructions from Inspector Puran Singh states that the challan has been presented. Charges have been framed. 4 prosecution witnesses have been examined out of total 30 witnesses. The trial of the case may take time in its conclusion.

At this stage, without meaning anything on merits of the case, it would be just and appropriate to grant regular bail to the

petitioner. Let the petitioner be enlarged on regular bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

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

31.01.2020

Prince

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No