



CRM-M-26619-2026

-1-

(209)

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

CRM-M-26619-2026

Date of Decision: 15.05.2026

VIJAY SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus**STATE OF HARYANA**

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDIPresent: Mr. D.N. Ganeriwala, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, Asstt. A.G., Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (ORAL)

The prayer in this 2nd petition under Section 483 BNSS is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.586 dated 06.11.2025 registered under Sections 7 & 13 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and Sections 61(2), 308(6), 199(3) of BNS, 2023 (Sections 120B, 388, 166A(b) of IPC) at Police Station Civil Lines, Sirsa.

2. As per the prosecution case, one Seema Rani @ Simran Kaur daughter of Sukha Singh (subsequently nominated as an accused) levelled allegations against Pawan Bansal for committing rape upon her. The complaint was made to Sub-Inspector Jagdish Chander (granted bail vide order dated 07.05.2026 passed in CRM-M-17208-2026) who is alleged to have pressurized Pawan Bansal to effect a settlement and thereby received

**CRM-M-26619-2026****-2-**

amount of Rs.2,30,000/- through ASI Vijay Singh (petitioner) and received Rs.10,000/- as his share. Kanchan (granted bail vide order dated 07.05.2026 passed in CRM-M-19816-2026) who is a part of the conspiracy received Rs.75,000/- as her share.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The allegations are baseless. As the petitioner is in custody since 07.11.2025 but only 01 of the 16 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 two co-accused have been granted bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel contends that the petitioner and his co-accused extorted a huge amount of money on the pretext of rape allegations having been levelled upon Pawan Bansal. The nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner and others does not entitle him to the concession of bail. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 07.11.2025 but only 01 of the 16 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far and that 02 co-accused have been granted 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. Admittedly, the petitioner is in custody since 07.11.2025 but only 01 of the 16 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation the

**CRM-M-26619-2026****-3-**

further incarceration of the petitioner is not required particularly when 02 co-accused namely, Jagdish Chander and Kanchan have been granted bail and complainant-PW1/Pawan Bansal stands examined during the Trial.

7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-Vijay Singh S/o Shyonarayan is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. The petitioner shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the Trial and inform in writing each time that he is not involved in any other crime other than the present case.

9. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.50,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from trial without sufficient cause.

10. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

15.05.2026

JITESH

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