

CRM-M No.13693 of 2024
Date of Decision:04.04.2024

...Respondent

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
04	16.02.2024	Vigilance Bureau Range, Amritsar Punjab	Sections 7-A of the Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act, 2018

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above, has come up before this Court under Section 439 CrPC seeking bail.
2. Reply dated 03.04.2024 on behalf of the State filed in Court today, is taken on record. A copy thereof has been supplied to the counsel for the petitioner.
3. Vide order dated 21.03.2024, the petitioner was granted interim bail, which is continuing till date.
4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has complied with the condition mentioned vide order dated 21.03.2024 and prays for grant of bail.
5. On the other hand, by way of filing of reply counsel for the State opposes the bail.
6. Prosecution's case is being taken from reply dated 03.04.2024 filed by Deputy Superintendent of Police, Vigilance Bureau, EOW, Punjab, SAS Nagar which reads as follows:

“The present FIR was registered on the statement/ complaint of Baljeet Kaur to the effect that she is married to Balwinder Singh and there is same matrimonial dispute going on between them. That one Bindu who is know to her husband gave beatings to her and threatened her to not go to her husband’s home. That the present petitioner/ accused took Rs.20,000/- for filing complaint on her behalf to the police. That anyhow, the matrimonial dispute was compromised between them for the sum of Rs. 1,25,000/- to be paid to her by her husband but he later backed out from the compromise. That when she brought this fact in the notice of the present petitioner, the present petitioner demanded Rs.20-25 thousand more for giving to SHO P.S. Narot Jaimal Singh and to Madam Baljinder Kaur, President Women Wing Bhoha in order to get her husband arrested. That she made a recording of this bribe demand and submitted it for lodging the present FIR. And upon this complaint the present FIR was registered. “

7. I have heard the counsel for the parties and gone through the record.
8. Given the facts and circumstances peculiar to the case coupled with the fact that petitioner had complied with the conditions and nature of allegations involved and also the period of custody which is approximately one and half month, there would be no justification for further pre-trial incarceration.
9. Given above, the present petition is allowed and interim order dated 21.03.2024 is made absolute. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

04.04.2024
Sonia Puri

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.