

2025:PHHC:081215



206/2.

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

CRM-M-34408-2024

Date of decision: 08.07.2025

Harinder Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Ms. Parul Panchal, Advocate, for
Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S.Deol, Senior DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail, under Section 438 of Cr.P.C., in case FIR No.18, dated 23.04.2024, under Sections 7, 7A, 13 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Amended vide Amendment Act 2018) and Section 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau Patiala, District Patiala.

2. On 05.02.2025, while noticing the following submissions, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and co-accused and asked them to join investigation:-

“The allegation against the petitioner-Jaspreet Singh (in CRM-M-28927-2024) is that he, while working as Clerk in the Jail Department of Punjab, got transferred an amount of Rs.65,000/- in the account of co-accused Harinder Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-34408-2024) on account of dealing with

the application of complainant for change of jail, as her husband Gurpreet Singh was confined in District Jail, Sangrur, as a convict in two FIRs under NDPS Act.

It has been submitted by the counsel representing the petitioner-Harinder Singh that Jaspreet Singh, being co-villagers, deposited the amount in his account, as he gave his ATM being his friend.

Learned State counsel submits that there is a call recording regarding the transaction between the petitioner-Jaspreet Singh and the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that baseless allegations have been levelled against the petitioners; they undertake to even give their voice samples to the Investigating Agency in order to assist in the investigation.”

Thereafter, on the adjourned date i.e. 03.04.2025, the following order was passed:-

“Learned State counsel has submitted that on the previous date of hearing, the petitioners had been extended the concession of interim bail subject to they providing their respective voice samples to the investigating agency and also cooperating with the investigating agency with respect to other aspects of the case. It has been submitted that although voice samples have been given to the investigating agency by the petitioners, however, they have not been cooperating with the investigating agency and hence, their custodial interrogation would be required.

Learned counsel for the petitioners pray for one last opportunity to yet again join investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency.

Adjourned to 08.07.2025.

Interim order to continue till the next date of hearing only.

Learned State counsel is also directed to reverify the criminal antecedents of the petitioners.

Copy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.”

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed the submissions made by the counsel opposite that the petitioner, who is a private individual, has complied with the order dated 03.04.2025, and cooperated with the Investigating Agency.

4. On a pointed query, learned State counsel, on instructions, after re-verifying, has conceded that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

6. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 05.02.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

July 08, 2025
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No