



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

CRM-M-31286-2025

Date of Decision:04.07.2025

Ranbir

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Akshay Kumar Dahiya, Advocate for
Mr. Kunal Muthreja, 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. 09, dated 07.04.2025, 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 Ajit son of Ishwar and the same has been reproduced below:-

“Respected sir, SHO, ACB Faridabad, It is requested that I Ajit S/o Ishwar resident of Village Distt. Faridabad, and I work as a driver in Sunil Transport, and I supply water in the city on TATA 1916 which is brand new and registration is yet to come. When I supply water then on LS chowk near JCB chowk a Traffic police constable always stops me from last one month and ask for money and on his pocket, Ranbir is written and now he is making pressure upon me for giving monthly, who has told me to give a monthly of 8000 till evening and has

threatened to impound the vehicle in case no money. Who is calling me in the with 8000 of bribe and I do not want to give him this bribe money. Legal action be taken against Constable Ranbir. I have no enmity with him in past”.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that there was no recovery from the present petitioner and the alleged recovery of tainted money was effected from a bag, which was kept near the petitioner. He further contends that there was no evidence to show that the petitioner had ever demanded bribe from the complainant or any other person. He further contends that mere recovery from a bag near the petitioner would not be sufficient to initiate the prosecution of the petitioner under the provisions of P.C. Act. The petitioner was wrongly arrested on 07.04.2025 and is in custody since then. Learned counsel further contends that after completion of the investigation, challan has been presented against him and charges have not been framed against him.

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. In the present case, the petitioner was allegedly caught red handed by the police, while accepting bribe from the complainant. Thus, allegations are very serious against him, however, the petitioner is in custody for the last about 03 months and his custody is not required for the purpose of investigation in any manner. Moreover, the prosecution has failed to produce any evidence to

show that the petitioner is in a position to tamper with the prosecution evidence. 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.

04.07.2025
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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