

211

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-23705-2021

Date of decision: 02.11.2021

Pawan Kumar

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. B.S. Rana, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Nayandeep Rana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Dimple Jain, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Gagandeep Goyal, Advocate for the complainant.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

[1] Due to COVID-19 situation, the Court is convened through video conference.

[2] This petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is filed seeking regular bail in F.I.R. No. 292, dated 12th October, 2020, under Sections 409, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC and Sections 7 and 13 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Sections 409, 120-B IPC and Section 13 of P.C. Act as per challan), registered at Police Station Sector 40, District Gurugram.

[3] The complainant in the F.I.R. is Parveen Mehran. As per allegations in the F.I.R., the petitioner demanded illegal gratification in the year 2010 when the electricity meter of the premises owned by the complainant was burnt. There were further allegations that he had paid Rs. 60,000/- to the petitioner who was posted as Assistant Lineman, for depositing in his bill account whereas it was deposited in someone else

account.

[4] Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that there is a delay of ten years in lodging the F.I.R. Petitioner is in custody since 22nd December, 2020. Investigation is complete and no recovery is to be made.

[5] Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail and submits that petitioner is involved in other FIRs also. She further submits that petitioner was detained in FIR No. 207 dated 14th July, 2020, registered at Police Station Sector 56, Gurugram. He was produced on production warrant in the present case. She fairly submits that challan stands presented.

[6] Without commenting upon the merits of the case, considering the time gap in lodging the FIR and facts that investigation is complete and conclusion of trial is likely to take time, the petitioner is granted regular bail subject to furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

[7] The petition is allowed.

[8] However, it is clarified that nothing stated hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

2nd November, 2021

pankaj baweja

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes