



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(204) CRM-M-12673-2026 (O & M)
Date of decision: 13.03.2026

ASI Rajbir No.121/Nuh

.... Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Rahul Deswal, Advocate with
Mr. Siddharth Gautam, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in the present petition under Section 483 BNSS, (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.) is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.41 dated 25.11.2025 under Sections 7, 13(1)(B), 13(B) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 registered at Police Station ACB, Gurugram, District State Vigilance and Anti Corruption Bureau, Haryana.

2. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that complainant Narender Kumar was posted as Manager in SD Express Logistics Pvt. Ltd. Gurugram. There are 15 vehicles under him. Rahul was driver on vehicle No. RJ-32-GD-8807 and he was going to Mumbai via Delhi-Mumbai Express Highway and when he stopped his car for taking refreshment, some police officials came there and took the said vehicle to Police Post Jaisinghpur. The complainant had tried to get released the said vehicle from police officials three times. Investigating Officer was demanding Rs.10,000/- to release the said vehicle despite the fact that there was an order



complainant met with Investigating Officer and requested him to release the vehicle. Rajbir (petitioner) demanded Rs.10,000/- to release the said vehicle. On the same day, a complaint was given to ACP and thereafter, a raiding party was constituted. Shri Vinesh Kumar, DTP Nuh was appointed as Duty Magistrate and after completion of all formalities, the raiding party was reached near Police Post Jaisinghpura. After receiving signal, the raiding party nabbed EHC Ghanshyam (since granted the concession of bail vide order dated 18.02.2026, Annexure P-8) and ASI Rajbir. During the course of investigation, as pointed out by the complainant, Rs.9,000/- taken as a bribe by the investigating officer Rajbir (petitioner) were recovered from under the cushion at the northern corner of his desk. Thereafter hand-wash proceedings were conducted of the complainant and accused persons and they were arrested and FIR was got registered in this regard.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has not demanded any illegal gratification. In fact, even as per the prosecution case, in the disclosure statement of his co-accused/EHC Ghanshyam, there is no reference with respect to handling, counting, accepting and retaining the tainted currency notes by the petitioner. As he is in custody since 25.11.2025, the report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. (Section 193 BNSS) stands submitted but none of the 23 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail, moreso, when a co-accused has been granted the concession of bail.

4. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, contends that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner of receiving



illegal gratification. Therefore, the nature of the allegations do not entitle him to the concession as prayed for. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 25.11.2025, the report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. (193 BNSS) stands presented, none of the 23 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far and that a co-accused has been granted the concession of bail.

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. As he is in custody since 25.11.2025, the report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. (193 BNSS) stands presented but none of the 23 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required, moreso, when a co-accused has been granted the similar concession of bail.
7. Thus, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner, namely, ASI Rajbir No.121/NUH is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.
8. This petition stands disposed of.
9. The pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

March 13, 2026

sukhpreet

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)

JUDGE