



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

220

CRM-M-58041-2024
Date of Decision: 02.12.2024

YASH PAL

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Akshay Kumar Jindal, Advocate
for the petitioner,

Mr. Rajinder Kumar Banku, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 482 of BNS with a prayer to grant pre-arrest bail in case FIR No.2162 dated 13.09.2023 registered under Section(s) 7, 8, 12 and 13 of P.C. Act, 1988 and Sections 166 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Shivaji Nagar, Gurugram (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was initially not named in the FIR and has been arrayed as an accused only on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused namely Suresh Kumar, Sanjeev Mishra @ Sanju, Ashish @ Bhola and Harbans during the course of investigation. He further contends that the co-accused namely Sandeep Prasad and Poonam Batra have already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide orders Annexures P-11 and P-12 respectively. Another



co-accused namely Yashpal has been granted the concession of bail by the learned trial Court vide order Annexure P-13. Learned counsel further contends that in the present case, challan has already been presented against the co-accused and the custodial interrogation may not be required.

3. Status report by way of an affidavit of the Assistant Commissioner of Police, City, Gurugram, Haryana has been filed on behalf of the respondent-State and the same is taken on record.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that sufficient incriminating evidence has been found against the petitioner. Even during the custodial interrogation of the co-accused, it has been found that the petitioner was receiving an illegal gratification on behalf of certain officials.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. In the present case, other accused, who were apprehended at the spot have already been granted the concession of regular bail. Similarly placed co-accused Sandeep Prasad and Poonam Batra have already been admitted to the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court. Apart from that, documentary evidence has already been collected by the police and challan has been presented against the co-accused. Thus, his further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose.



7. In view of the above, without commenting any further on the merits, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned.

02.12.2024

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)

M.Sikka

JUDGE

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