



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

CRM-M-16489-2025

Date of Decision:30.07.2025

Dhanwant Singh Randhawa

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and Anr.

...Respondents

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

Present : Mr. P.S Ahluwalia, Advocate with
Mr. Keerat Dhillon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

Mr.N.P.S Mann, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.04 dated 05.03.2025 under Sections 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Amended) Act, 2018 and Section 61(2) of the BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, FS-1, Mohali.
2. While granting the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court on 28.04.2025, the following contentions were noticed by this Court and the same have been reproduced below:-

“Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner inter alia submits that the petitioner is presently serving as Block Development and Panchayat Officer (BDPO), has been falsely implicated in the present case registered under Section 7 of the PC Act. It is contended that gravamen of the allegations pertains to

an alleged demand of bribe in connection with the issuance of Utilization Certificates for works executed by the complainant; however, no specific or direct allegation of demand or acceptance of illegal gratification has been attributed to the present petitioner.

It is further submitted that the name of the petitioner surfaced solely on account of the disclosure statement of the co-accused, Avneet Singh Bajwa, who at the relevant time, was serving as the Panchayat Secretary. Inviting the attention of this Court to the contents of the FIR in question (Annexure P-1), learned counsel contends that there is no allegation therein that the petitioner himself made any demand for bribe from the complainant. Instead, it is the case of the prosecution that in a purported telephonic conversation, co-accused Avneet Singh allegedly demand bribe from the complainant while taking the name of the petitioner.

Learned counsel has further urged that the falsity of the allegations against the petitioner becomes evident, when the audio transcript of the said telephonic conversation, annexed as Annexure R-2, is perused in its entirety. It is submitted that during the conversation, which took place on 05.03.2025, co-accused Avneet Singh is heard inducing the complainant to pay the bribe amount by stating that since the meeting of the BDPO (i.e. the petitioner) was scheduled on the same day, the matter may likely be pushed through 'in the heat of the moment'.

Significantly, it has been submitted that the co-accused is also heard persuading the complainant to deliver the bribe amount that very day as the petitioner would 'sit down and open documents' the following day thereby clearly indicating that the petitioner was not present at that time nor was he shown to be aware of the demand being made in his name.

It has, therefore, been strenuously contended that the co-

accused, on his own accord, misused the name of the petitioner to demand illegal gratification without any knowledge, consent or involvement of the petitioner. The absence of any overt act, telephonic communication, or recorded conversation involving the petitioner himself has been highlighted by the learned counsel to show that the present case, as far as the petitioner is concerned, is based on conjecture and surmise”.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has reiterated the submissions and further submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation may not be required.
4. Learned State counsel also submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for further investigation.
5. In view of the above statement made by learned counsel for the parties, the interim order dated 28.04.2025 is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S.

30.07.2025
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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