

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

208

CRM-M-9897-2023

Date of Decision: 01.03.2023

Angrej Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Samar Pratap Singh Ahluwalia and Mr. Parndeeep
Ahluwalia Khehar, Advocates, for the petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered against him vide FIR No.17 dated 17.11.2022 at Police Station State Vigilance Bureau (SVB), Panchkula, under Sections 7, 13(1)B read with Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act and Section 120-B IPC.
2. The allegations, in nutshell, are that co-accused Poonam, who was posted as ASI, had demanded an amount of Rs.20,000/- as bribe, which was later settled at Rs.10,000/-, so as to ensure that no action is taken against the complainant's son, who was having a matrimonial dispute with his wife. Pursuant to the complainant reporting the matter to the Vigilance Bureau, a trap was laid. It is further the case of prosecution that on the day when the complainant went to the police station to hand over the amount (tainted currency) to the co-accused Poonam, ASI Angrej (petitioner) was

also present there and the co-accused told the complainant to go outside and that the petitioner - Angrej will settle the matter. It is further the case of prosecution that when complainant went out, the complainant passed on the said amount to ASI Angrej Singh (petitioner) and who was caught red-handed at the spot.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the present case and that admittedly no demand had ever been made by the petitioner and that it is the co-accused Poonam, who is alleged to have demanded the bribe and that it was at her instance the amount had allegedly been handed over to the petitioner, who had no clue whatsoever as to why the said amount had been given to him.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner as well as co-accused Poonam were hands in glove for the purpose of extracting bribe from the complainant and since the petitioner was caught red-handed while accepting tainted currency notes, his complicity is clearly evident. Learned State counsel has, however, informed that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last about 3 months & 11 days and that challan already stands presented. It has also been informed that charges are yet to be framed and as many as 18 PWs have been cited.
5. This Court has considered rival submissions.
6. The petitioner is alleged to have been arrested while accepting bribe from the complainant. However, the entire investigation is stated to have been concluded and challan stands presented. Charges have not been framed so far and as many as 18 PWs have been cited. As such, it goes without

saying that conclusion of trial is likely to consume time. In these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose. Accordingly, the petition is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is however, directed that the aforesaid order shall be subject to the condition that the petitioner shall furnish voice sample, as and when directed, and not threaten the complainant, in any manner. In case, it is found that the petitioner does not cooperate for furnishing voice samples or is found to be intimidating the witnesses, it shall be open to the prosecution to move an application for cancellation of bail.

01.03.2023

Vimal

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGEWhether speaking/reasoned: **Yes/No**Whether reportable: **Yes/No**