



231

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

**CRM-M-36773-2025
Date of Decision:18.07.2025**

SUKHDEV

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

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

Present : Mr. Simar Pal Singh, Advocate &
Mr. Zorawar S. Chauhan, 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 BNSS with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.11 dated 28.03.2025, registered under Sections 7, 13(1)(B), 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, Police Station Anti-Corruption Bureau, District Gurugram.

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Neha D/o Hari Kishan and the same has been reproduced below:-



“To, The Superintendent of Police, Vigilance, Sector-47, Gurugram. Respected Sir, I, Neha, daughter of Hari Kishan, resident of Village Raisina, Tehsil Sohna, District Gurugram, submit that I took admission in 2019 in the Law College, Sector-40, Gurugram. I belong to the Scheduled Caste category, and my family falls under the Below Poverty Line (BPL) category. Therefore, I receive a government scholarship every year. In the first two years, I did not apply for the scholarship. Later, upon learning about it, I applied for the scholarship in 2021. I have paid all my semester fees online on time for my course from 2019 to 2024. I have completed my 5-year BA LLB course, and I have already received approximately ₹1,50,000 as scholarship from the Haryana Government for the years 2023 and 2024. When I went to the college in Sector-40 to collect my degree, I met Sukhdev Singh, who, I learned, is posted as an Assistant in the administrative building. When I requested my degree, Sukhdev Singh told me that if I wanted my original degree, I would have to give him the amount of scholarship money I had received from the government. He further asked me to have my father speak with him about this matter. Accordingly, on 25.03.2025, from my mobile phone number 8930980085, I arranged for my father Hari Kishan to speak with Sukhdev Singh on his mobile number 7988847509. During this conversation, Sukhdev demanded ₹2,50,000 in exchange for handing over my degree. My father pleaded with him, saying the amount was too high as he was a poor man and could not pay such a large sum. Sukhdev then said that at least ₹1,00,000 must be paid and agreed to settle for that amount. I overheard this entire conversation, as I had turned on the speaker of my mobile phone. I recorded this conversation on my phone and will submit it to you later. Sukhdev, the Assistant, will not give me my BA LLB degree without taking the money. Today, Sukhdev called me from his mobile number 7988847509 on my number 8930980085 and asked me to bring the bribe money. There has



been no financial transaction or prior enmity between me, my father, and Sukhdev. Being a law student, I do not wish to pay a bribe to a corrupt government official. Legal action should be taken against this corrupt Sukhdev. Sd/ Neha d/o Hari Kishan, R/o Raiseena, District Gururam, M.no. 8930980085."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case and the recovery of Rs.1,00,000/- was planted on him. Even from the transcript of the audio record itself proves that the petitioner had never raised any demand from the complainant. Even the petitioner was ordered to be arrested in the present case on 28.03.2025 and after completion of investigation, the challan has been presented against him. He further contends that the prosecution has relied upon 18 witnesses, but no witness has been examined so far and there are no chances of early conclusion of the trial.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is the main accused and does not deserves the concession of bail.

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

6. In the present case, the petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last about 04 months and after completion of investigation, final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has been presented before the competent Court. The prosecution has placed reliance on 18 witnesses, but no witness has been examined so far. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful 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 him furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

18.07.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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