

2025:PHHC:068449



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

**CRM M-25163 of 2025
Date of Decision: 20.05.2025**

Pardeep Kumar ...Petitioner
Vs.
State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Dr. Pankaj Nanhera, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of B.N.S.S., 2023 with a prayer to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No. 03 dated 06.02.2025 under Sections 7, 7-A, 8, 13(1)(b) read with Section 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act, registered at Police Station Anti Corruption Bureau, District Gurugram, Haryana.

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Juber Ahmed son of Din Mohammad and the true translation of the same has been reproduced below:-

“To Inspector, ACB Gurugram Sir. I request that I am Juber Ahmed son of Din Mohammad resident of Ward No. 11 Ferozepur Jhirka Nuh. I have been working as a computer operator in the office of Sub Division,

Additional Officer (Civil) Ferozepur Jhirka for the last several years. I was transferred from this office to the office of Deputy Commissioner Nuh in the month of October 2024. During my posting in the office of Sub Divisional Officer, Ferozepur Jhirka, I had conversation with Sarpanch Gram Panchayat Karheda Rampal, Block Nagina District Nuh. He told me that an investigation of mine is pending in your office, recommend to SDM sir to make my investigation in my favour. On which I told the said SDM sir for the recommendation of the Sarpanch. On which SDM sir told me to tell the Sarpanch that if he wants to get his investigation filed then it will cost 4 lakh rupees, there is a lot of expenditure in the office. I told this to the Sarpanch. After this, I was transferred to the office of Deputy Commissioner, Nuh and after a few days the Sarpanch came to me and said that get my work done and gave me 3 lakh rupees in cash in exchange for getting the work done. But I neither wanted to take bribe nor give bribe nor did I want to get into this mess. After that I talked to the village secretary Haseen in this regard, he said that I will talk to SDM Sahab and tell you. On which the village secretary Hasin told me that SDM Sahab has said that he has demanded 4 lakh rupees for this work. But I thought that the Sarpanch's work will be done without giving money. But after a few days the Sarpanch said that I gave you money and my work was also not done. On which I met the secretary with the Sarpanch today on 06.02.2025, here the secretary said in front of the Sarpanch that SDM Sahab will not do your work without taking money. I did not want to give the money given to me by the Sarpanch to

the Secretary and SDM, that is why I have come to you today. Today I have only 3 lakh rupees. I do not want to give this money to Secretary Hasin and SDM Sahab. Justice should be done to me and legal action should be taken against the above-mentioned Secretary Haseen and SDM. Today I have recorded the conversation with Secretary Haseen regarding bribe in front of Sarpanch Rampal on my mobile, which I will present to you later. I have no personal enmity with Secretary Haseen and SDM XXXXX.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the allegations levelled by the complainant, Rampal, Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat, Karhera, District Nuh has approached him to get an inquiry decided in his favour. The complainant asked the SDM to favour Rampal in inquiry, on which she demanded Rs. 4 lakh. After few days, the Sarpanch came to the complainant and gave him Rs. 3 lakhs in cash to get the inquiry decided in his favour. The complainant approached Haseen, Village Secretary, regarding this matter, who talked to the SDM and told the complainant that SDM had demanded a sum of Rs. 4 lakhs for the said purpose. On this, the complainant has approached the officials of Anti Corruption Bureau and requested them to take action against Haseen Village Secretary and the SDM. The trap was laid and Haseen Village Secretary was apprehended with cash of Rs.3 lakhs.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was working as reader of the SDM, Ferozepur Jhirka.

Neither his name was mentioned in the FIR nor he had taken any money nor had given any money to the SDM. Even, he had no concern with the inquiry in question and has been falsely involved by the police. Even, Rampal Sarpanch was removed from the post of Sarpanch by the Deputy Commissioner, Nuh and the SDM was not in a position to reinstate the Sarpanch. Even, Haseen, who was caught red handed by the police had contacted the SDM directly to get work of Sarpanch done from her. Thus, the petitioner had no reason to ask for the bribe from the complainant in the present case.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that on 06.02.2025, the complainant alongwith Rampal, Sarpanch, had met Haseen, Village Secretary, who told that the SDM would not do the said work without taking money. After the trap was laid, Haseen, Village Secretary, was apprehended red handed while accepting Rs.3 lakhs as bribe. During the course of investigation, Haseen was interrogated and he disclosed that he had talked to Pardeep Kumar, petitioner, who was also reader of the SDM. He had contacted the SDM through the present petitioner only. Learned counsel has referred to the disclosure statement suffered by Haseen, Village Secretary (Annexure R-1) in this regard. He further contends that even the statement of complainant was recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. Further, Haseen, Village Secretary, co-accused

had forwarded one inquiry report dated 20.01.2025 of Smt. Famida, Sarpanch on the mobile phone of the petitioner on Whatsapp, so that Rampal, Sarpanch, may also be exonerated in same manner. This conclusively proves that Haseen, Village Secretary, had contacted the SDM through the petitioner, who was reader of the SDM. Even, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be required to find the role of the SDM and her steno in the present case. Even, the petitioner is absconding since the date of FIR and reward of Rs. 10,000/- has been announced upon him by the Government.

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

6. In the present case, the petitioner was directed to join the investigation by the police but he is absconding and his post crime conduct also raises suspicion about his involvement in the crime. Moreover, the complainant had recorded his conversation with Haseen, Village Secretary/co-accused, in which, there is reference of the present petitioner. Apart from that, Haseen, co-accused had also sent an order to the petitioner on Whatsapp, so that the same order may be passed in the case of Rampal Sarpanch, to exonerate him during inquiry by the SDM. Apart from that, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to know the exact role of the SDM and her steno in the commission of the offence.

7. Finding no merits in the present petition, the same is ordered to be dismissed.

20.05.2025
amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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