

225 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-35338-2023
Decided on: 14.09.2023

...Petitioner

Versus

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Ankur Lal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
43	28.11.2022	State Vigilance Bureau, Gurugram	409, 418, 420, 467, 468, 120B IPC and 13(1)(c), 13(1)(D) & 13(2) of PC Act

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above, has come up before this Court under Section 439 CrPC seeking bail.
2. Allegations against the petitioner are that he in connivance with other co-accused, facilitate in the re-allotment of SCO in the name of same company which already lose litigation qua the original allotment.
3. Vide order dated 01.09.2023, the petitioner was granted interim bail subject to complying with some conditions.
4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that they have voluntarily complied with the order dated 01.09.2023 and handed over the affidavits to the State counsel.
5. Counsel for the State, on instructions does not dispute the contention made by counsel for the petitioner, however opposes the bail.
6. Considering the compliance of the previous order and petitioner's pre-trial custody, interim order dated 01.09.2023 is made absolute. It is clarified that the petitioner is entitled to bail simply on the grounds of pre-trial custody of around 4 months as such, since the petitioner is being given bail on pre-trial custody, other

CRM-M-35338-2023

2023:PHHC:121159

accused shall not be entitled to claim benefit of bail on parity except in case they have similarly placed custody.

7. Petition is allowed in the terms mentioned above. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

14.09.2023
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.