

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

221

CRM-M-5574-2022

Date of Decision: 15.02.2022

Hari Om Sharma

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Akshat Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is nothing on record to prove that the petitioner had obtained the alleged bribe for an amount of Rs. 5 lacs from the complainant. He further submits that the petitioner is present in the police station.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from SHO Rajinder Singh, opposed the bail and submits that custodial interrogation is required. He further submits that the money had passed hands and in fact the complainant was befooled and money was obtained.

As per the initial instructions imparted to the State, the petitioner had pretended himself to be Superintendent of Police. However a perusal of the FIR reveals that in fact he demanded money in the name of Superintendent of Police. Be that as it may it does not change the colour of crime.

Given above, custodial interrogation is required and the petitioner fails to make out a case for the bail. Petition dismissed and the interim orders are recalled.

There would be no need for a certified copy of this order and any Advocate can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. In case the attesting officer wants to verify the authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

15.02.2022
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No