

2025:PHHC:106981



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

245

CRM M-40195-2025

Date of Decision:18.08.2025

Parduman Sharma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Deepinder Singh Virk, Advocate for
Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J.

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of the B.N.S.S., 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail in case FIR No.12 dated 29.04.2025 registered under Sections 13(2) read with Section 13(1) A of the Prevention of Corruption Act and Section 409, 465, 466, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau Range, Ferozepur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations in the present case pertains to the year 2021 whereas the FIR came into existence on 29th April 2025. He further contends that the allegations levelled against the petitioner were regarding one bill No. 44 dated 18.06.2024 and before registration of the FIR, the matter has been examined three times by the department and the allegations

were found to be false. He further contends that during the inquiry by the Deputy Director, Ferozepur Division, the statement of Amandeep Grover, AFSO, Jaitu was also recorded, wherein, he stated that the bills had been checked and were made in accordance with the work carried out by the department and the complaint was without any basis. Learned counsel further submits that the case is based on documentary evidence, which has already been collected by the police and final *challan* has been presented against the accused in the present case. The petitioner was arrested on 30th April 2025 and in is custody for the last almost 04 months. He further submits that co-accused Pawan Kumar has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 04.07.2025 (Annexure P-13).

3. A short reply by way of an affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Vigilance Bureau, Unit Faridkot, District Faridkot has been filed on behalf of the respondent-State and the same is taken on record.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of regular bail.

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

6. In the present case, the petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last about 04 months and *challan* has been presented against him. Moreover, out of 24 witnesses, no witness has been examined so far and the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time.

7. In view of the above, without commenting any further on the merits, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned.

18.08.2025
amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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