

2025:PHHC:015629



108.

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

CRM-M-6168-2025

Date of decision: 03.02.2025

Amritpal Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Ranjit Singh Sidhu, Advocate, for the petitioner
(through Video Conferencing).

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail, under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, in case FIR No.2, dated 15.01.2025, under Section 7 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, Phase-1, District SAS Nagar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case, wherein it is alleged that he demanded a bribe of Rs.50,000/- from the complainant in exchange for extending a favourable outcome in an enquiry pending against the complainant before the Economic Offences Wing, Phase-1, Mohali. However, learned counsel has emphasized that no amount has been recovered from the petitioner. Further, while drawing the attention of this

Court to the allegations in the FIR (Annexure P-1), learned counsel has argued that the falsity of the allegations is evident from the fact that the alleged bribe money was recovered from the possession of co-accused Gurpreet Singh. He further submits that the only allegation against the petitioner pertains to the demand for a bribe, and thus, the essential ingredients of Section 7 of Prevention of Corruption Act are not satisfied against the petitioner.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Learned State counsel while vehemently opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, has reiterated the seriousness of the allegations levelled in the FIR in question. It has been further contended by the learned State counsel, on instructions, that the allegations against the petitioner are specific; although the alleged bribe money was recovered from co-accused Gurpreet Singh, a private computer operator, he had accepted the money on behalf of none other than the petitioner. Furthermore, it has been submitted, on instructions, that there exists recorded conversation between the petitioner and the complainant corroborating the demand for a bribe.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

Prima facie, the allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious. As per the allegations in the FIR, the petitioner demanded bribe in

the sum of Rs.50,000/- through co-accused Gurpreet Singh to influence an ongoing enquiry in favour of the complainant. The gravity of the offence is further heightened by the fact that the bribe money was allegedly accepted by the co-accused acting as a conduit for the petitioner, which lends credence to the allegations of corruption and abuse of official position. Additionally, the presence of call recordings allegedly corroborating the demand for a bribe cannot be ignored at this stage.

Given the nature of the allegations and the material available on record, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Present petition stands dismissed accordingly.

However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

February 03, 2025

sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No