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

CRM-M-47934-2023
Reserved on: 11.10.2023
Pronounced on: 19.10. 2023

Rohit Hans ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab …Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Arnav Sood, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, AAG, Punjab.

****

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
0025	21.07.2023	Vigilance Bureau, Phase-I, Punjab at Mohali, District SAS Nagar	7 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 as amended by of Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act, 2018 and section 120-B IPC

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above, has come up before this Court under Section 439 CrPC seeking bail.

2. In paragraph 15 of the bail petition, the accused declares that he has no criminal antecedents

3. Petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and is also voluntarily agreeable to the condition that till the conclusion of the trial before the trial court, the petitioner shall keep only one mobile number, which is mentioned in AADHAR card, and within fifteen days of release from prison undertakes to disconnect all other mobile numbers. The petitioner contends that the further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and family.

4. The State opposes bail.

REASONING:

5. The facts of the case are extracted from reply dated 11.10.2023. The relevant

Sonia Arora
2023.10.19 16:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

paragraphs are extracted hereinunder:-

> *"2. Facts of the case are that the complainant Gurmail Singh son of Harnek Singh got registered a complaint on dated 20.07 2023 by stating that three persons in civil clothes came into his room on 17.07.2023 at Hoshiarpur and one of them disclosed his name as Senior Constable Kinder Singh and started searching his room. After searching, they did not find anything, but they forcefully took away Rs. 55,000/- as bribe from him for not registering a false NDPS case against him and also demanded Rs.2.50,000/- more for the said purpose*
>
> *3 That it is brought to the kind notice of this Hon'ble Court that thereafter, the complainant contacted the Vigilance Bureau and FIR was registered on 21.07.2023 and the trap was laid by the Vigilance Bureau along with government witness where Senior Constable Kinder Singh sent Rohit Hans a private person (Present Petitioner) to the residence of complainant for collecting the amount of Rs. 1.00,000/- and the Vigilance Team caught him red handed and an amount of Rs. 1,00,000/-was recovered from his pocket*
>
> *5. That it is pertinent to mention here that during the disclosure statement the senior constable Kinder Singh disclosed that on 17.07.2023, lie along with Constable Amit Kumar and PHG Jujhar Singh went to the complainant and received amount of Rs.55,000/ for not registering a false NDPS case against him and out of said amount he gave Rs 5000 to constable Amit Kumar and Rs 2200/- to PHG Jujhar Singh and spent Rs 2000/- in filling fuel in his car. He also disclosed that he has concealed ID card and Andhar card of the complainant Gurmail Singh in his Baleno Car which were recovered based on his disclosure.*
>
> *6. That from the submissions made above, it becomes clear that the petitioner is actively involved in the above said crime. Rohit Hans (Present Petitioner) went to the residence of complainant for collecting the amount of Rs 1,00,000/- and the Vigilance Team caught him red handed in the presence of government witnesses and an amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- was recovered from his pocket.*

5(a). Considering the fact that the petitioner is a public servant and was working as a conduit/tout of the main accused and had gone to collect the money in which he had a share. There would not be any justifiable reason to keep him in further custody as he is in custody for around three months.

6. As per paragraph 8 of the bail petition, the petitioner is in custody since 21.07.2023. Given the penal provisions invoked viz-a-viz pre-trial custody, coupled with the primafacie analysis of the nature of allegations, and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability further pre-trial incarceration at this stage, subject to the compliance of terms and conditions mentioned in this order.

7. In Sanjay Chandra v. Central Bureau of Investigation, (2012) 1 SCC 40, Supreme Court holds,

Sonia Arora
2023.10.19 16:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

> [28] We are conscious of the fact that the accused are charged with economic offences of huge magnitude. We are also conscious of the fact that the offences alleged, if proved, may jeopardize the economy of the country. At the same time, we cannot lose sight of the fact that the investigating agency has already completed investigation and the charge sheet is already filed before the Special Judge, CBI, New Delhi. Therefore, their presence in the custody may not be necessary for further investigation. We are of the view that the appellants are entitled to the grant of bail pending trial on stringent conditions in order to ally the apprehension expressed by CBI.

8. The possibility of the accused influencing the investigation, tampering with evidence, intimidating witnesses, and the likelihood of fleeing justice, can be taken care of by imposing elaborative and stringent conditions. In Sushila Aggarwal v. State (NCT of Delhi),**2020:INSC:106 [Para 92]**, (2020) 5 SCC 1, Para 92, the Constitutional Bench held that unusually, subject to the evidence produced, the Courts can impose restrictive conditions.

9. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail, subject to the following terms and conditions, which shall be over and above and irrespective of the contents of the form of bail bonds in chapter XXXIII of CrPC, 1973.

10. In Madhu Tanwar v. State of Punjab, **2023:PHHC:077618 [Para 10, 21]**, CRM-M-27097-2023, decided on 29-05-2023, this court observed,

> [10] The exponential growth in technology and artificial intelligence has transformed identification techniques remarkably. Voice, gait, and facial recognition are incredibly sophisticated and pervasive. Impersonation, as we know it traditionally, has virtually become impossible. Thus, the remedy lies that whenever a judge or an officer believes that the accused might be a flight risk or has a history of fleeing from justice, then in such cases, appropriate conditions can be inserted that all the expenditure that shall be incurred to trace them, shall be recovered from such person, and the State shall have a lien over their assets to make good the loss.
>
> [21] In this era when the knowledge revolution has just begun, to keep pace with exponential and unimaginable changes the technology has brought to human lives, it is only fitting that the dependence of the accused on surety is minimized by giving alternative options. Furthermore, there should be no insistence to provide permanent addresses when people either do not have permanent abodes or intend to re-locate.

Sonia Arora
2023.10.19 16:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

11. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above, in the following terms**:**

(a). Petitioner to furnish personal bond of Rs. Ten thousand (INR 10,000/); AND

(b) To give one surety of Rs. Twenty-five thousand (INR 25,000/-), to the satisfaction of the concerned court, and in case of non-availability, to any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned officer/court must satisfy that if the accused fails to appear in court, then such surety can produce the accused before the court.

OR

(b). Petitioner to hand over to the concerned court a fixed deposit for Rs. Ten thousand only (INR 10,000/-), with the clause of automatic renewal of the principal and the interest reverting to the linked account, made in favor of the 'Chief Judicial Magistrate' of the concerned district, or blocking the aforesaid amount in favour of the concerned 'Chief Judicial Magistrate'. Said fixed deposit or blocking funds can be from any of the banks where the stake of the State is more than 50% or from any of the well-established and stable private sector banks. In case the bankers are not willing to make a Fixed Deposit in such eventuality it shall be permissible for the petitioner to prepare an account payee demand draft favouring concerned Chief Judicial Magistrate for the similar amount.

(c). Such court shall have a lien over the funds until the case's closure or discharged by substitution, or up to the expiry of the period mentioned under S. 437-A CrPC, 1973, and at that stage, subject to the proceedings under S. 446 CrPC, the entire amount of fixed deposit, less taxes if any, shall be endorsed/returned to the depositor.

(d). The petitioner is to also execute a bond for attendance in the concerned court(s) as and when asked to do so. The presentation of the personal bond shall be deemed acceptance of the declarations made in the bail petition and all other stipulations, terms, and conditions of section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, and of this bail order.

(e). While furnishing personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	

Sonia Arora
2023.10.19 16:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

2.	Passport number, (If available), when the court attesting the bonds, thinksappropriate or considers the accused as a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

12. The petitioner shall not influence, browbeat, pressurize, make any inducement, threat, or promise, directly or indirectly, to the witnesses, the Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and the circumstances of the case, to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police, or the Court, or to tamper with the evidence.

13. Petitioner to comply with their undertaking made in the bail petition, made before this court through counsel as reflected at the beginning of this order. If the petitioner fails to comply with any of such undertakings, then on this ground alone, the bail might be canceled, and the victim/complainant may file any such application for the cancellation of bail, and the State shall file the said application.

14. The petitioner is directed not to keep more than one prepaid SIM, i.e., one pre-paid mobile phone number, till the conclusion of the trial; however, this restriction is only on prepaid SIMs [mobile numbers] and not on post-paid connections or landline numbers. The petitioner must comply with this condition within fifteen days of release from prison. The concerned DySP shall also direct all the telecom service providers to deactivate all prepaid SIM cards and prepaid mobile numbers issued to the petitioner, except the one that is mentioned as the primary number/ default number linked with the AADHAAR card and further that till the no objection from the concerned SHO, the mobile service providers shall not issue second pre-paid SIM/ mobile number in the petitioner's name. Since, as on date, in India, there are only four prominent mobile service providers, namely BSNL, Airtel, Vodafone-Idea, and Reliance Jio, any other telecom service provider are directed to comply with the directions of the concerned Superintendent of Police/Commissioner of Police, issued in this regard and disable all prepaid mobile phone numbers issued in the name of the petitioner, except the main number/default number linked with AADHAR, by taking such information from the petitioner's AADHAR details or any other source, for which they shall be legally entitled by this order. This condition shall continue till the completion of the trial or closure of the case, whichever is earlier. In Vernon v. The State of Maharashtra, **2023 INSC 655**, [para 45], while granting bail under Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 2002, Supreme Court had directed imposition of the similar condition, which reads as follows, "(d) Both

Sonia Arora
2023.10.19 16:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

the appellants shall use only one Mobile Phone each, during the time they remain on bail and shall inform the Investigating Officer of the NIA, their respective mobile numbers."

15. During the trial's pendency, if the petitioner repeats or commits any offence where the sentence prescribed is more than seven years or violates any condition as stipulated in this order, it shall always be permissible to the respondent to apply for cancellation of this bail. It shall further be open for any investigating agency to bring it to the notice of the Court seized of the subsequent application that the accused was earlier cautioned not to indulge in criminal activities. Otherwise, the bail bonds shall remain in force throughout the trial and after that in Section 437-A of the Cr.P.C., if not canceled due to non-appearance or breach of conditions.

16. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this Court are to endeavour that the accused tries to reform, does not repeat the offence and to provide an opportunity to the victim to consider legal remedies for recovery of the amount. In Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi**, 2022:INSC:735 [Para 28]**, Writ Petition (Criminal) No 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court holds that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed." .

17. Any Advocate for the petitioner and the Officer in whose presence the petitioner puts signatures on personal bonds shall explain all conditions of this bail order in any language that the petitioner understands.

18. If the petitioner finds the bond amount beyond social and financial reach, it may be brought to the notice of this Court for appropriate reduction. Further, if the petitioner finds bail condition(s) as violating fundamental, human, or other rights, or causing difficulty due to any situation, then for modification of such term(s), the petitioner may file a reasoned application before this Court, and after taking cognizance, even to the Court taking cognizance or the trial Court, as the case may be, and such Court shall also be competent to modify or delete any condition.

19. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the merits of the case nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

20. In return for the protection from incarceration, the Court believes that the accused

Sonia Arora
2023.10.19 16:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

shall also reciprocate through desirable behavior.

21. *There would be no need for a certified copy of this order for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. In case the attesting officer wants to verify the authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.*

Petition allowed in aforesaid terms. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

19.10.2023
sonia arora

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.

Sonia Arora
2023.10.19 16:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document