

Bal Krishan Sayal vs State Of Punjab on 28 January, 1987

Equivalent citations: AIR1987SC689, 1987(35)BLJR259, 1987CRILJ533, JT1987(1)SC281, 1987(1)SCALE172, (1987)2SCC647, 1987(1)UJ479(SC), AIR 1987 SUPREME COURT 689, 1987 (2) SCC 647, 1987 ALL CRI LR 274, 1987 (1.1) IJR (SC) 332, 1987 CURCRIJ 182, 1987 UP CRIR 110, 1987 SCC(CRI) 408, 1988 (1) CRIMES 555.1, 1987 BLJR 259, 1987 JT 281, 1987 (1) UJ (SC) 479, 1988 CHANDLR(CIV&CRI) 94, (1987) SC CR R 89, 1987 CHANDLR(CIV&CRI) 507, (1987) 2 CRILC 68, (1987) ALLCRIR 274, (1987) 1 ALLCRILR 168, (1987) PAT LJR 38, (1987) 2 SCJ 43, (1987) 2 CURLJ(CCR) 193

Author: Ranganath Misra

Bench: M.M. Dutt, Ranganath Misra

JUDGMENT

Ranganath Misra, J.

1. This appeal is by special leave and the affirming judgment of the Punjab & Haryana High Court upholding the convictions and sentences of the appellant under Section 5(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act and Section 161 of the Indian Penal Code is sought to be set aside.

2. The appellant was a clerk in the Personnel Branch of the Divisional Superintendent, Northern Railway at Firozpur. One Gurcharan Ram, a fitter in the railway establishment had become liable to penal rent in respect of the official residence occupied by him. The prosecution alleged that the appellant demanded a bribe of Rs. 100/- from Gurcharan Ram to obtain an order of waiver of the penal rent. Gurcharan Ram pleaded that he was not in a position to pay the amount demanded and it was ultimately settled that the sum of Rs. 100/- would be paid in five instalments of Rs. 20/- each. With reference to the payment of the first instalment a trap was arranged and soon after the bribe of Rs. 20/- had been received, the trap party recovered the amount. The defence was one of the total denial.

3. Two outsider witnesses had been examined in the case being Khazan Singh as noticed by the High Court, did not speak as to what transpired in the conversation between the bribe giver and the appellant. The other witness too was not very clear as to what talk preceded the passing of the two currency notes. The High Court took the view that even if the prosecution had not indicated what exactly the conversation was, once the passing of the two currency notes was accepted it was for the appellant to explain the circumstance under which the same had been received. Another contention which had been raised before the High Court was that the total penal rent due from Gurcharan Ram

was Rs. 102/- and to obtain waiver of this it was unlikely that Gurcharan would to find have agreed to pay a sum of Rs. 100/- as bribe. We wanted to find out exactly how much of penal rent was due and, therefore, sent for the record. From the record it is apparent that the demand was of Rs. 102/- which Gurcharan Ram wanted to be waived. There is no material to show whether there was likelihood of any additional demand to b3e raised against him. Taking the unsatisfactory character of the prosecution evidence in regard to the conversation preceding the passing of the currency notes and the feature that for waiver of Rs. 102/-, the bribe of Rs. 100/- was offered, we are inclined to take the view that the prosecution has failed to establish its case beyond reasonable doubt and the appellant is entitled to this benefit of this situation. The appeal is allowed and the convictions and the sentences are set aside.