

2025:PHHC:102300



CRM-M-39187-2025 (O & M)

::1::

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(227)**

**CRM-M-39187-2025 (O & M)
Date of decision: 07.08.2025**

Dr. Naresh Verma

..... Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Akshay Kumar Jindal, Advocate,
with Mr. Vikrant Verma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P. Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in this petition under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of the regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.21 dated 12.08.2023 under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act and Section 201 of the IPC registered at Police Station ACB Hisar, District Hisar, Haryana.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner who was earlier posted as CMO, Hisar, is alleged to have demanded an amount of Rs.10 lacs from the complainant and accepted Rs.5 lacs to save the complainant, his wife and another doctor from prosecution under the provisions of the Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971.

2025:PHHC:102300



CRM-M-39187-2025 (O & M)

::2::

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. There is no evidence of demand or acceptance in the instant case. Even as per the report of the FSL, it has been found that the voice recording was probably of the person giving the sample. In fact, the present FIR is a counter-blast to an FIR No. 580 dated 09.08.2023 against the complainant-Dr. Sahil and his wife/Dr. Somika under the provisions of PNDT Act, Drug and Cosmetics Act and the IPC at Police Station Hansi City at the instance of Dr. Prabhu Dayal, Nodal Officer. Be that as it may, as the petitioner is in custody since 28.04.2025, the report under Section 173(2) Cr.P.C. stands presented but none of the 28 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The learned counsel for the State has filed a reply dated 06.08.2025 which is taken on record. While referring to the said reply, he contends that the complainant had recorded the conversation between him and the accused wherein the accused can clearly be heard demanding a bribe. The voice samples were sent for analysis and have been found to be that of the accused and the complainant-Dr. Sahil. Therefore, as the offence stands established, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of bail. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 28.04.2025, the report under Section 173(2) Cr.P.C. stands presented but none of the 28 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

2025:PHHC:102300



CRM-M-39187-2025 (O & M)

::3::

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.
6. The veracity of the prosecution case against the petitioner and his co-accused shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the Trial. Admittedly, the petitioner is in custody since 28.04.2025 but none of the 28 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.. Therefore, the Trial in the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.
7. Thus, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner, namely, Dr. Naresh Verma is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.
8. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from Trial without sufficient cause.
9. The present petition stands disposed of.
10. The pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

August 07, 2025
sukhpreet

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No