

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-37722-2023 (O&M)
Reserved on: 21.09.2023
Pronounced on: 19.10.2023

Shyam Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent (s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present:- Mr. M.S. Khaira, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Jaswinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manish Bansal, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
22	13.7.2022	State Vigilance Bureau, Faridabad, District Faridabad	120-B, 406, 420 IPC and Sections 13(1)(c)(d)(i)(ii) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

1. Apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above, the petitioner who is an Ex-Sarpanch, had come up before this Court seeking anticipatory bail under Section 438 CrPC.
2. As per paragraphs 4 and 6 of the bail petition, the accused declares that two complaints were filed against him for causing financial irregularities in the Gram Panchayat, one before the Lokayukta, Haryana and one before the State Vigilance Bureau and one FIR was also registered against him. However, he has not given details of the FIR.
3. The allegations against the petitioner are that he in connivance with co-accused Dinesh Kumar (Panchayat Secretary) leased out the village land at much lesser price than the previous years. As per Punjab Village Common Lands (Regulation) Act, 1961, not more than 10 acres of land can be leased out to an individual. However, the petitioner and his co-accused, flouting the said rules, allotted land beyond 10 acres. It

has also been alleged that the accused misappropriated the panchayat funds in connivance with each other.

4. Vide order dated 6.9.2023, this Court had granted interim bail to the petitioner, primarily because the petitioner’s counsel had stated that they would have no objection in case this Court imposes any stringent conditions including declaration of assets. The said order is continuing till date.

5. Counsel for the petitioner submits that he has voluntarily complied with the conditions mentioned in the order dated 6.9.2023.

6. State has not disputed the contention made by counsel for the petitioner.

7. Given above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 6.9.2023 is made absolute. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

October 19, 2023
AK

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No