



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

213

CRM-M-47093 of 2024
Date of decision: 27.01.2025

Supinder Singh

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Amit Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Ranbir Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita in case FIR No.186 dated 27.07.2024 under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, registered at Police Station Mataur, District SAS Nagar, Punjab.

2. On 24.10.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:-

“Learned counsel inter alia contends that the falsity of the allegations levelled in the FIR in question is evident from the fact that as per the sworn-in affidavit dated 04.07.2024 of the complainant, complaint dated



04.05.2024 was given by him with respect to some cheating committed with his niece Kusum Lata by Immigration Ratpur on the pretext of sending her abroad. Learned counsel submits that as per the allegations levelled against the petitioner, the petitioner demanded Rs.50,000/- for getting an FIR registered against the person who had cheated the niece of the complainant, which was then allegedly handed over to the petitioner. Learned counsel further submits that it is a matter of record that on 17.05.2024 i.e. before the sworn-in affidavit of the complainant was given with respect to the demand of bribe, the petitioner had already recommended registration of an FIR against the person who had cheated the complainant's niece, hence, in the circumstances, it left no manner of doubt that totally false allegations have been leveled against the petitioner in the sworn-in affidavit which led to the registration of the FIR in question (Annexure P-1) under Section 7 of the Act.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from Inspector Varinder Singh, has not been able to dispute that on 17.05.2024, the petitioner had indeed recommended registration of an FIR against the person who had allegedly cheated the niece of the complainant. On a further query, it has also not been disputed by the learned State counsel, on instructions, that apart from the sworn-in affidavit of the complainant, no other evidence had been produced by the complainant in support of the allegations against the petitioner.”



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 24.10.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. 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.

5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 24.10.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

January 27, 2025
poonam

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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