



CRM-M No. 12743 of 2025

1

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

222

CRM-M No. 12743 of 2025
Date of decision: 07.07.2025

Ashok Kumar

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Jatinder Kumar Kansal , Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) in case FIR No.3 dated 14.01.2025 under Section 7, 7-A of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, Unit, District Patiala.

2. On the last date of hearing on 06.03.2025, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was working as a Sweeper in MC, Rajpura and, hence, it is highly improbable that he would have raised a demand of Rs.1 lakh from the complainant to get NOC with respect to his site plan. It has been further



CRM-M No. 12743 of 2025

2

argued that although it has been alleged that a demand of extraneous consideration had been made by him and co-accused from the complainant, however, it is not even the case of the complainant that any extraneous consideration was received from the complainant. Furthermore, learned counsel submits that since the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents, he be admitted to anticipatory bail, moreso when he is willing to join investigation, cooperate with the investigating agency and also undertakes to give his voice sample to demolish the case of the prosecution that there was an audio recording between him and the complainant with respect to the alleged demand of bribe.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 06.03.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Sanjeev Kumar, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for her custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 06.03.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

July 07,2025
archana

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