



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

228

CRM-M-4795-2025

Date of decision: 31.01.2025

Jagroop Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mrs. Riffi Birla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.50 dated 06.11.2024 under Sections 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, (Amendment Act), 2008 registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, Range, Amritsar, District Tarn Taran.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 06.11.2024 in the present case, wherein he has been falsely implicated. It has been urged that as per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner was allegedly caught red handed while accepting a bribe from the complainant on behalf of the prime accused, Harmandeep Singh, who was working as Personal Assistant to Deputy Commissioner. Learned counsel submits that however, as per the case of the prosecution itself, it was co-accused Harmandeep Singh who made the demand for bribe from the complainant. Learned counsel



CRM-M-4795-2025

has urged that the petitioner, a daily wage worker employed as a peon in the office of co-accused Harmandeep Singh, merely collected the money at the behest of his superior, without any knowledge of the background or the alleged demand for the bribe.

3. It has been further argued that the alleged bribe was demanded by co-accused Harmandeep Singh for clearing certain bills of the complainant, a matter in which the petitioner had no role, as it was exclusively to be handled by co-accused Harmandeep Singh. Additionally, it has been submitted that the conversations regarding the alleged bribe were solely between the complainant and the co-accused. Learned counsel has submitted that the investigation in the present case is complete, challan has been presented, and charges have already been framed. Given these circumstances, there is no likelihood of the petitioner tampering with evidence.

4. Furthermore, it has been pointed out that none of the 17 prosecution witnesses have been examined to date, and as a result, the conclusion of the trial in the near future appears improbable.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, has not disputed the custody period of the petitioner or the stage of trial. It has also not been disputed that the petitioner was a daily wage worker in the office of co-accused Harmandeep Singh, who was serving in the office of the Deputy Commissioner. Moreover, it has also not been disputed, on instructions, that there is no audio recording of the petitioner making any demand for bribe from the complainant.



CRM-M-4795-2025

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

7. Although the petitioner was allegedly caught red handed with the bribe money, the prosecution itself concedes that the bribe demand was made by co-accused Harmandeep Singh. The audio recordings as per the learned State counsel pertain only to conversations between the co-accused and the complainant, not the petitioner. The investigation is complete and charges framed. Given that none of the 17 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, there is no likelihood of the trial concluding in the near future. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. Needless to add, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

31.01.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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