



259

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

CRM-M-42591-2025**Date of Decision:12.08.2025**

Jasbir Singh

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Mohit Jaggi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. On the oral request made by learned counsel for the petitioner, Section 170 IPC is ordered to be added in the headnote as well as the prayer clause of the main petition. Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to carry out the necessary correction in Court itself.

2. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.13 dated 13.06.2024 registered under Sections 420 and 170 of IPC and Section 7-A of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, Ferozepur, District Ferozepur.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the provisions of Section 7-A of the Prevention of Corruption Act have been wrongly invoked against the petitioner and no offence, as alleged is made out against him. He further contends that the petitioner was wrongly arrested in the present case on 13.06.2024 and is in custody for the last more than 01 year and 02 months.

After completion of investigation, challan was filed against him and now during the course of trial, 5 witnesses have been partly recorded, out of total 17 witnesses. He next contends that the statements of 12 witnesses are yet to be recorded and the trial Court may take considerable time in concluding the trial. Moreover, the petitioner is not in a position to influence the witnesses of the prosecution.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that two more FIRs have been ordered to be registered against the petitioner. However, he admits that the petitioner is acquitted in one case.

5. I have heard the 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 more than 01 year and 02 months. The prosecution has partly examined 05 witnesses, out of total 17 witnesses so far. Thus, the petitioner is not in a position to influence the witnesses of the prosecution. Further, the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time and 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.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

12.08.2025

hemlata

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