



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(215)**

CRM-M-44946-2025 (O & M)

Date of decision: 26.09.2025

Mukesh Kumar

.... Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Parveen Sharma, 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 (Section 439 Cr.P.C, 1973) is for the grant of the regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0016 dated 27.05.2025 under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Later Section 7A, 13(1)(b) read with Section 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 added) registered at Police Station State Vigilance & Anti-Corruption Bureau, Rohtak, District Rohtak.

2. The brief facts of the case are that ASI Mukesh Kumar (petitioner) and Paras son of Pardeep were apprehended while accepting illegal gratification of Rs.40,000/- from the complainant so as not to demolish his house.



3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The amount of Rs.40,000/- has not been recovered from the petitioner but from his co-accused/Paras. As the petitioner is in custody since 27.05.2025 but none of the 25 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, has filed a reply dated 22.09.2025 which is taken on record. While referring to the said reply, he contends that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are grave inasmuch as he demanded an illegal gratification so as to not demolish the house of the complainant and accepted Rs.40,000/- for the said purpose. Therefore, he is not entitled to the concession as prayed for. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 27.05.2025 and none of the 25 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

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 27.05.2025 but none of the 25 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, Mukesh Kumar is



ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

- 8. The present petition stands disposed of.
- 9. The pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

September 26, 2025
sukhpreet

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