



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-22806-2024 (O&M)
Date of order: 16.05.2024

Paramjit Singh @ Pamma
... Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab
...Respondent (s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA
Present:- Mr. G.S. Thind, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).
Mr. Sukhdev Singh, AAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
16	28.3.2024	Vigilance Bureau, Patiala Range, Patiala	7A P.C.Act and 420/120-B IPC

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 439 CrPC seeking bail.
2. The petitioner-accused has not declared his criminal antecedents. However, as per the reply filed three more FIRs are pending against the petitioner.
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. State's counsel opposes the bail and contends that given the criminal past, the accused is likely to indulge in crime once released on bail.
5. Prosecution's case is extracted from reply filed by the State by way of affidavit of



concerned DySP, which reads as under:-

“4. That it is respectfully submitted that above said complainant has marked to Sh. Harsimranjit Singh, Inspector of Police, Vigilance Bureau Unit, Patiala for enquiry and during the enquiry statement of complainant and accused/petitioner Sahil Goyal was recorded. However, co-accused Paramjit Singh alias Pamma has never turned to the office of Vigilance Bureau Patiala to record his explanation statement despite several calls made to him on his mobile no. 98785-62029 and 62805-20410 and various notices had been issued to him by Department of Vigilance Bureau.

5. That it is respectfully submitted that complainant Jagsir Singh while recording his statement has disclosed that his mother Smt. Pappi Devi was elected as Sarpanch in Panchayati Elections held in the year 2013 and remained Sarpanch of village Arnetu for the period year 2013 to year 2018. During her tenure as Sarpanch, various grants had received from the Government for the development of the village and all those grants were spent by his mother for the development works of the village with the consent of the entire Panchayat. But from among his relatives, the son of his uncle Sh. Mam Chand son of Sh. Phalku resident of village Arnetu, Tehsil Patran District Patiala had reported a complaint to Vigilance Patiala against the complainant's mother that she has embezzled grants during the tenure of being Sarpanch. In pursuit of this, the complainant came to office of Vigilance Bureau Vaddi Baradari Patiala in the month June 2022, where he met with his acquaintance/co-accused Paramjit Singh alias Pamma, whom he disclosed about the complaint given against his mother, then co-accused Paramjit Singh alias Pamma has told the complainant that he and his friend Sahil Goyal (petitioner/accused) are very well acquainted with S.S.P Hundal and other officers of Vigilance Department and further assured the complainant that he will get his work done from S.S.P. In pursuit of this work, co-accused Parmajit Singh alias Pamma has raised a demand of Rs.2,50,000/- from the complainant, out of which the complainant has given Rs.1,50,000/- in cash to the co-accused Paramjit Singh alias Pamma and accused/petitioner Sahil Goyal on dated 18.06.2022 outside the boundary of office of vigilance bureau Patiala in presence of Binder Ram son of Veera Ram resident of Arnetu and Rs.1,00,000/- has given to accused/petitioner Sahil Goyal in his residence on dated 20.08.2022 in the presence of Jagmeet Ram son of Sahllu Ram resident of Arnetu, who put it in his table's drawer after counting. The complainant has also made a video recording of accused/petitioner Sahil Goyal while counting said Rs.1,00,000/- by him on his mobile phone. After going through the video, it was found that the accused/petitioner is counting money by sitting next to the complainant and giving his consent for receiving money in the audio recording. The true translation of transcript of the audio recording is enclosed herewith as ANNEXURE-R-1/T for kind consideration of Hon'ble Court.

6. That it is respectfully submitted that an explanation statement of accused/petitioner Sahil Goyal was also recorded after joined him in enquiry, who admitted in his statement that he and co-accused Paramjit Singh alias Pamma have received Rs.2,50,000/- from the complainant in the names of Seniors officers of Vigilance Department with intent to cheat the complainant. After going through the oral statements and documentary evidence produced during the enquiry, a report is submitted with a suggestion to register the case under section 7-A P.C. Act 1988 as amended by P.C. (Amendment) Act, 2018, section 420 and 120-B of IPC against co-accused Paramjit Singh @ Pamma and accused/petitioner Sahil Goyal. True Translation of enquiry report is enclosed herewith as ANNEXURE-R- 2 / T for kind consideration of Hon'ble Court.

7. That it is respectfully submitted that after going through the enquiry report and the documentary as well as oral evidence, Ld. Senior Superintendent of Police, Vigilance Bureau, Range Patiala, Patiala has directed the Ld. Deputy Superintendent of Police, Vigilance Bureau Unit, Patiala to register and investigate



the case against co-accused Paramjit Singh @ Pamma and accused/petitioner Sahil Goyal under section 7-A P.C. Act 1988 as amended by P.C. (Amendment) Act, 2018, section 420 and 120-B of IPC. In pursuit of said direction, a FIR no.16 dated 28.03.2024, under section 7-A of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 amended by Prevention of Corruption Act (Amendment, 2018) and section 420, 120-B of IPC registered at Police Station: Vigilance Bureau, District Patiala against the accused Paramjit Singh alias Pamma and Sahil Goyal.”

6. As per paragraph 2 of the bail petition, the petitioner is in custody since 1.4.2024. Although the petitioner has not mentioned the criminal history of the petitioner, but given the penal provisions invoked viz-a-viz pre-trial custody, coupled with the *prima facie* analysis of the nature of allegations, and the other factors peculiar to this case, this Court is not drawing any adverse inference against the petitioner for withholding criminal history, and thus, there would be no justifiability for 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,

[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 allay 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.

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 court, and in case of non-availability, to any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned 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 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	
2.	Passport number, (If available), when the court attesting the bonds, thinks appropriate 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 prepaid 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 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 a sense of security to the victim. 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 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 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

May 16, 2024
AK

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No