



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

CRM-M-31183-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision:04.07.2025

Rajesh Kumar Vashisht

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in a case FIR No. 11, dated 22.04.2025, under Sections 7,13(1)(b) r/w 13(2) of P.C Act, registered at Police Station ACB, Faridabad (Annexure P-1).
2. The F.I.R in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Manoj Malik son of late Gyani Ram and the same has been reproduced below:-

“To, Inspector Vigilance, Faridabad. Sir, it is requested that I am Manoj Malik son of late Gyani Ram resident of H.No. 186, Sector-2, Faridabad. My sister Rekha Nain who lives in USA, She has a house in Arya Nagar Faridabad in her name. For the maintenance of which my sister is getting the GPA of the house done in my name. For which she had done all the formalities of GPA from USA and sent the documents to me through post in January 2025. After a few days I had submitted the GPA documents along with my application in DC office, Sector-12,

Faridabad, where they said that your documents will be sent to DRO office, you can inquire from DRO office after a few days. After about a week of which I went to DC office. When I went there, the employee sitting there told me that your documents have reached the DRO office on the second floor. After that I went to the DRO office and an employee named Subhash said that your file has reached us, we will start the process now, come and check after few days. After this I went to the DRO office many times but no action was taken on my file. After this the concerned employee named Subhash was transferred, in his place an employee named Rajesh Vashisht came, even after that I met Rajesh many times, but Rajesh also told me that these files take time. Today I again reached the DRO office with my acquaintance Raj Singh son of Shri Bir Chand resident of Village Atali, District Faridabad, where I met Rajesh Vashisht, who demanded a bribe of Rs. 15 thousand from me in exchange for doing the work. I said that I do not have that much money, then he said that DRO will not agree, then after my repeated requests Rajesh Vashisht started talking about doing the work for 12 thousand rupees. My acquaintance Raj Singh had made a video recording of this entire conversation of bribe transaction in his mobile phone, which I will present to you separately later. I have no enmity with Rajesh Vashisht nor do I have any kind of monetary transaction with him. I do not want to give bribe to Rajesh Vashisht, employee D.R.O. office Faridabad. Please take legal action against him. Signature: Manoj Malik son of late Gyani Ram resident of House No. 186, Sector-2, Faridabad”.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner had joined the office of DRO, Faridabad about 19 days prior to the alleged incident and he was not empowered to help the complainant, in any manner. He further contends that since the petitioner was not competent to deal with the matter of the complainant, he had no occasion or reason to demand bribe from him. The petitioner was wrongly arrested by the police on 22.04.2025 and is in custody

since then. After completion of investigation, challan has been presented against him and the charge has not been framed so far. He further contends that the prosecution has relied upon 14 witnesses, but no witness has been examined so far and the trial is likely not to conclude in near future.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully in the present case.

6. The petitioner is stated to be in custody since 22.04.2025 and investigation has already been completed against him. Moreover, the case is based on the testimony of the complainant and the official witnesses and the petitioner may not be in a position to influence the witnesses of the prosecution. Even, the trial is not likely to conclude in near future. Thus, further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

8. Pending application(s), if any, stand(s), disposed of, accordingly.

04.07.2025
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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