



231

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

**CRM-M-59808-2024**

**Date of Decision: 21.01.2025**

Ajay

...Petitioner

VS.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Pankaj Bali, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

1. 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.21 dated 20.09.2024 registered under Sections 7, 13(1)(b) read with Section 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, at Police Station Anti-Corruption Bureau, Karnal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the version of the prosecution is highly improbable and unbelievable. The petitioner was appointed as a Clerk in the office of Municipal Corporation, Panipat under the HKRNL Scheme and was not authorized to change/correct the ID of property in the records of the Municipal Corporation. In fact, the petitioner had clearly refused to change/modify the ID of the complainant and due to the said grudge, the petitioner was falsely involved in the present case. He further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 20.09.2024 and had given his



voice sample for FSL examination. The petitioner is in custody for the last about 05 months and the challan has already been presented against him. Still further, the case is based on the testimony of the complainant and to other official witnesses and the petitioner is not in a position to tamper with the evidence of the prosecution.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner was caught red handed, while accepting the bribe from the complainant and the petition deserves to be dismissed.

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

5. At this stage, it is apparent that the petitioner is in custody since last 05 months and no prosecution witness has been examined so far. Thus, the conclusion of the trial may take considerable time and further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose.

6. 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.

21.01.2025  
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)  
JUDGE

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