



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

148

CRM-M-15409-2025
Date of decision: 20.03.2025

Ramesh Chander

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.04 dated 18.02.2025 under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau Patiala, District Patiala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that there has been an inordinate delay in lodging the FIR, as the alleged incident occurred in September, 2024, whereas the FIR was registered only on 18.02.2025. Learned counsel further asserts that the petitioner never demanded any illegal gratification from the complainant and has been serving in his department for a considerable period without any prior complaints against him. Learned counsel, therefore, prays that the petitioner be extended the concession of bail as he is willing to join investigation and cooperate with the investigating



CRM-M-15409-2025

agency.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On asking of the Court, Mr. H.S. Deol, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

5. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He, on instructions, has submitted that the investigating agency is in possession of a video recording wherein the petitioner is seen counting the bribe money. It is further submitted that specific allegations exist against the petitioner regarding the demand of Rs.50,000/- to prevent the transfer of jail inmates, of which Rs.30,000/- was actually accepted. Additionally, it is pointed out, on instructions, that the petitioner is also involved in another FIR under the provisions of the Prisons Act, 1894, which clearly points to his misconduct as a public servant.

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

7. A perusal of the FIR in question reveals that the petitioner allegedly demanded a bribe of Rs.50,000/- from some of the jail inmates to prevent their transfer from Central Jail, Patiala, to another facility. Upon persistent requests and pleading by the said prisoners/inmates, a petitioner agreed to accept a reduced sum of Rs.30,000/-. Subsequently, in the first week of September, 2024, he made a WhatsApp call from his mobile phone to Dharminder Singh, Sarpanch of village Raipur Mandla, and arranged to collect the money outside Thapar College, Patiala.



CRM-M-15409-2025

8. During the transaction, while petitioner was counting the received amount of Rs.30,000/-, Dharminder Singh, Sarpanch, secretly recorded a video of the incident. The video allegedly captures the petitioner handling and counting the money. Since the petitioner is a public servant, the FIR in question for offences under the Prevention of Corruption Act was registered against him.

9. The allegations against the petitioner are of a serious and grave nature, involving the demand and acceptance of an illegal gratification of Rs.30,000/- in exchange for favouring prisoners by preventing their transfer. The presence of a video recording, which purportedly depicts the petitioner counting the bribe money, lends *prima facie* credence to the case of the prosecution.

10. The contention regarding the delay in the registration of the FIR does not, in itself, vitiate the case of the prosecution at this stage. In cases of such nature, victims or witnesses, particularly those in vulnerable positions like jail inmates, often hesitate to report misconduct immediately due to fear of reprisal. Moreover, mere delay cannot be a ground to throw away the case of the prosecution at this nascent stage.

11. The fact that the petitioner is also facing proceedings under the Prisons Act, 1894, further casts a shadow on his conduct as a public servant entrusted with custodial responsibilities.

12. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the presence of a video of footage, and the broader implications of the conduct of the petitioner who was a jail warden, this Court finds no ground to extend



CRM-M-15409-2025

the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The instant petition stands dismissed accordingly.

13. 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.

20.03.2025

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

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