



CRM-M-41980-2025

115-2

1

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

CRM-M-41980-2025

Date of decision:-28.11.2025

Sukhjeet Singh Sra @ Bagga

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.. Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Naveen Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepender Singh, Senior Advocate/Addl. A.G., Punjab with
Mr. Siddharth Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Advocate
for the victim.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner is seeking grant of regular bail in FIR No.14 dated 12.06.2025 registered for the offence under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (for short "the PC Act") and Sections 318, 61 (2) BNS at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, District Ludhiana. Offence under Section 8 of the PC Act was added during the course of investigation.

2. Counsel for the petitioner states that FIR, Annexure P1, has been registered on the statement of Karamjeet Singh @ Kamal, PA to Sh. Hakam Singh, Contractor, MLA Raikot, on the allegation that he came to know that SDM and his steno, Jatinder Singh and other staff members are accepting bribe for discharge of official duties. Complainant stated that a watch was kept on the activities of the officials and he has received information from

**CRM-M-41980-2025****115-2****2**

Gursewak Singh that steno, Jatinder Singh has received and kept two bags with cash in the almirah in office. As per complainant, this development was brought to the notice of the MLA as well as the police officials. Counsel submits that the allegation against the petitioner is in the shape of a CCTV recording to the effect that he was seen carrying a coloured bag to the office of steno and a few minutes later, he was seen walking out of the office without bag. Counsel states that petitioner was arrested on 14.06.2025, investigation qua him is complete and challan has been presented. Counsel asserts that petitioner is not visible in the CCTV footage, no recovery has been effected from him and he has been falsely implicated. Counsel points out that petitioner has been named as an accused in another criminal case, which is an outcome of a family discord. He submits that petitioner has been in detention for a substantial period and as he is no longer required for interrogation, he deserves to be enlarged on bail.

3. *Per contra*, State counsel, who is assisted by counsel for the victim, have opposed the petition. Reference has been made by the State counsel to the status report filed by the DSP, Vigilance Bureau, Ludhiana to submit that petitioner has paid bribe to a public servant and there is direct evidence against him. He asserts that a confessional statement was made by steno, Jatinder Singh as well as the petitioner, who have admitted their involvement in the offence and recovery of more than Rs.24 lakhs has been effected. State counsel submits that the third accused i.e. Gurbir Singh Kohli, SDM is yet to be apprehended and in case the petitioner is released on bail, there is a possibility that he may hamper the investigation. Counsel for

**CRM-M-41980-2025****115-2****3**

the victim points out that the second FIR registered against the petitioner is on the allegation that petitioner has cheated his relations and it is not a fallout of a family dispute.

4. I have heard counsel for the parties and considered their respective submissions.

5. Undoubtedly, allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious, but petitioner has been interrogated and investigation qua him has been completed. Petitioner has recorded a confessional statement admitting his role, but legality and veracity of the confessional statement recorded while in custody, would remain a subject matter of debate before the Trial Court and does not require to be examined by this Court at this stage. As is evident from the status report, challan has been presented, but charges are yet to be framed. Petitioner has been in custody for the last five and a half months and further incarceration would not be justified.

6. Accordingly, petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on furnishing adequate bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. It is clarified that nothing said hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

28.11.2025**Brij**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No