

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.

Website: www.courtkutchehry.com

**Printed For:** 

Date: 29/10/2025

## Raj Pal Vs State of Haryana

## Criminal Miscellaneous No. M-1947 of 2009

Court: High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Date of Decision: March 6, 2009

**Citation:** (2009) 30 CriminalCC 86: (2009) 2 RCR(Criminal) 692(1)

Hon'ble Judges: M.M.S. Bedi, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Pankaj Nanhera, for the Appellant; P.M. Anand, AAG, for the Respondent

Final Decision: Dismissed

## **Judgement**

M.M.S. Bedi, J.

The petitioner, as per the contents of the FIR has been stamped a thoroughly corrupt official indulging in demanding and

receiving a sum of Rs. 200/- per consumer while providing electricity connections under a scheme of the Government to provide electricity

connections to the persons below poverty line. On the basis of the allegations of the consumers, the FIR stands registered and he has also been

suspended.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that no recovery of any tainted amount has been made from the petitioner and that it is not

within the ambit of the jurisdiction of the petitioner to provide any electric connection to any of the consumers under the above said scheme. He

has further contended that one of the complainants, namely, Satpal is inimical towards the petitioner as the petitioner has got permanent

disconnection of his electric connection on account of his having failed to pay the bill.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the parties. The petitioner, no doubt, has got a probable defence against complainant Satpal but there have

been consistent Complaints against the petitioner for demanding and receiving money from the consumers. The plea of the petitioner that it is not

his duty to provide electric connection, may be a good defence and ground for seeking the concession of regular bail but granting pre-arrest bail to

a person against whom there are a number of complaints of corruption, cannot be granted the extra-ordinary relief of pre-arrest bail. The petition is

dismissed.

4. This order will not, in any manner, affect the rights of the petitioner to seek regular bail. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that a

direction be issued that the application for regular bail of the petitioner may be decided on the same day. The petitioner will be at liberty to make

such a request to the court concerned at the time of applying regular bail.