



218

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

**CRM-M-1549-2025
Date of Decision:13.02.2025**

RAJENDER DANGI @ RAJENDER SINGH

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

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

Present : Mr. Munish Mittal, Advocate with
Mr. Ankit Kamboj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, DAG, Haryana with
Mr. Narender Kumar Panwar, AAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.36 dated 18.10.2022, registered under Sections 7, 13(1) B & 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, Police Station SVB, Karnal, District State Vigilance Bureau, Karnal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the complainant, the alleged incident pertains to December, 2019 and the FIR in the



present case has been registered on 18.10.2022. He further contends that the petitioner had neither demanded any bribe from the complainant nor any amount was handed over to him. Still further, the complainant is a habitual complainant and has got registered several other cases in the past as well. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 04.11.2024 and is in custody for the last 3 months. The petitioner is a government servant and there are no chances of fleeing from the process of law. Even the investigation has been completed against him and the challan has been presented before the competent Court of law. Since, the trial is at initial stage, further custody of the petitioner may not serve any useful purpose.

3. Status report by way of an affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Anti Corruption Bureau, Karnal Range, Karnal 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 there are serious allegations against the petitioner and the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of regular bail.

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

6. The petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last more than 03 months. Even after completion of investigation, the challan has filed against him and his further detention will not serve any meaningful purpose.

7. 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.

13.02.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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