



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-58616-2024
Date of Decision:02.12.2024

Sanjeev Kumar ...Petitioner

VS.

State of Haryana ...Respondent

Coram : Hon’ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Sandeep Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajinder Kumar Banku, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of the B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.198 dated 10.09.2024 registered under Section 8 of P.C., Act, at Police Station Barara, District Ambala.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that one FIR No.74 dated 17.04.2024, under Sections 420,506,120-B of IPC, Police Station Barara, District Ambala was registered against five persons namely Neha Rani, Rajesh Kumar, Sanjeev Kumar, Satya Devi and Jasmer Singh. Even after registration of the FIR, the police had not taken any action against the accused. The petitioner requested the SHO to take action but instead of taking action against the accused, the petitioner was falsely involved in the present case. He further contends that the petitioner also submitted a representation to the higher police officers and requested them to transfer the investigation of this case to some

other district, but no action was taken on the said representation as well. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case as he had made complaints against the SHO of the police station. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 10.09.2024 and the challan has already been presented against the petitioner. He next contends that the petitioner is a first offender and was never involved in any other criminal activity.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner had received a sum of Rs.10,000/- as bribe and keeping in view the gravity of the allegations, the present petition is liable to be dismissed by this Court.

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

5. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 10.09.2024 and is in custody for the last about two months. The investigation has already been completed and the challan has been presented against the petitioner. Since, the trial has not even formally started, there are no chances of early conclusion of the trial.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on his furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

02.12.2024
hitesh