

In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh

CRM-M-19491-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 25.4.2023

Baljit Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. R.S.Rai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Karan Pathak, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Siddharth Attri, AAG, Punjab.

FIR No.	DATE	POLICE STATION	OFFENCES
04	20.01.2023	Vigilance Bureau PH-1 Punjab at Mohali, District SAS Nagar	7 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 as amended Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act 2018

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in a case registered in a case arising out of above mentioned FIR.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Sharanjit Singh wherein it is alleged that he is a businessman by profession and that a trial arising out of FIR No. 141, dated 20.8.2019, Police Station Gharinda, District

Amritsar Rural, under Sections 420, 120-B IPC, is pending against him as well as his parents and wife. The complainant alleged that the petitioner had met him in District Courts Amritsar and had represented that he is a Police Inspector and knows the Judicial Officer where the trial was pending and could help him and thus demanded an amount of Rs.10 lakhs from the complainant. It was agreed that an amount of Rs.7 lakhs would be paid in advance. However, the complainant did not wish to pay the said amount and reported the matter to the Vigilance Bureau. A trap was accordingly laid and the petitioner was caught red-handed while accepting a bribe of Rs.7 lakhs.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has falsely been implicated in the present case and that there is no substantial evidence to establish the allegations levelled against him.
4. On the other hand learned State counsel while opposing the petition has submitted that it is a case where the petitioner was caught red-handed while accepting the tainted currency notes. It has further been submitted that apart from the aforesaid evidence, there is call details record indicating that the petitioner as well as the Judicial Magistrate were regularly in touch with each other. Learned State counsel has however, informed that investigation already stands concluded and challan has been filed. It has been informed that charges are yet to be framed and as many as 15 PWs have been cited.
5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. Although, the police does claim to have substantial evidence against the petitioner. However, this Court finds that the petitioner has been behind bars for a substantial period of 7 months. The trial is yet to commence and as many as 15 PWs have been cited. In these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner would not be justified as conclusion of trial is likely to consume time. The petition, as such, 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.

25.4.2023
mohan

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No