

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

CRM-M-8159-2022
Date of Decision: 5th July, 2022

Jeet Ram

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. J.S. Bhinder, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Ms. Shailja Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

This petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure is filed seeking regular bail in FIR No.07 dated 5.7.2021 under Section 7 of Prevention of Corruption Act registered at Police Station State Vigilance Bureau, Hisar, District- Hisar.

The earlier bail petition was dismissed as withdrawn on 1.9.2021 with liberty to revive the prayer at a later stage.

As per the case set up, the petitioner-Sub-Inspector Jeet Ram took in his possession vehicle of the complainant bearing registration No. HR-26-HF-9529 and demanded Rs. 10,000/- for not registering FIR against the complainant. The complainant came to know that FIR No. 97 dated 8.6.2021 under Sections 279 and 337 IPC at P.S. Bhattu Kalan was already registered against him. He agreed to pay Rs. 7000/- and recorded the conversation between him and the petitioner. On complaint, a trap was laid and the petitioner was caught red handed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 5.7.2021 and the complainant has been examined. The petitioner is not involved in any other case.

Learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant oppose the prayer for grant of bail submitting that the petitioner was apprehended red handed and Rs. 4,000/- was recovered from him.

Without commenting on the merits of the case and considering that the petitioner is in custody since 5.7.2021, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents, being a police official prima facie there is no chance of his absconding and that conclusion of trial is likely to take time, the petitioner is granted bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition is allowed.

It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

5th July, 2022
anuradha

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |