

CRM-M-41694-2025

2026:PHHC:001696



122+229

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-41694-2025

Tej Ram

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

Date of decision: January 12, 2026

Date of Uploading: January 12, 2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. R.S. Rai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Anurag Arora, Advocate and
Mr. Sukhsharan Sra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG Haryana assisted by
Ms. Nidhi Nain, HPS, ACP, Murthal.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.136 dated 08.05.2025, for the offence punishable under Section 58 of the NDPS Act, 1988, Sections 308(6)/ 61 of the BNS, 2023 and Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, registered at Police Station Rai, District Sonapat.

2. The gravamen of allegations against the petitioner is that the petitioner, while posted as CIA In-charge, allegedly misused his official position to pressurize and threaten the officials, including the Chairman of World University of Design, in connection with the investigation of FIR

CRM-M-41694-2025

No.87/25 dated 28.03.2025, registered under Section 18(c) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985. As per the Special Observation Report annexed with Letter No.598 dated 08.05.2025 issued by the ACP, Sonapat, on the basis of which the present FIR was registered, it was observed that on 27.03.2025, an amount of ₹15 lakh in cash was delivered to an advocate to influence the matter and prevent further arrests; however, the said amount was later returned. Despite this, no effective steps were taken till 31.03.2025 to arrest Dhirender Mishra, and during this period, the petitioner allegedly obtained the location of the Chairman of World University of Design. It is further alleged that on 31.03.2025, Karambir, an official of the World University of Design, after meeting the petitioner through Advocate, namely, Gautam Sharma at the CIA office, informed the Chairman that the matter could be settled for an amount ranging between ₹80 lakh to ₹1 crore. The Chairman declined the proposal, citing the excessive demand and expressed his intention to explore legal alternatives.

On 01.04.2025, the petitioner allegedly applied for Call Detail Records (CDRs) and traced the location of the Chairman, followed by raids conducted at his residential areas in Punjab and Mohali. In his supplementary statement, Vijyant Bansal, Chairman of the World University of Design, Rai, Sonapat, stated that Inspector Tej Ram (*petitioner herein*) repeatedly pressured him to settle the matter, stating that he would suffer heavy losses because of one individual and that such matters are resolved through mutual settlement. The petitioner allegedly insisted on meetings

CRM-M-41694-2025

under the pretext of settlement and issued notices summoning him to the CIA office. It is further alleged that on 02.04.2025, when the Chairman sought clarification regarding settlement, the petitioner assured him of full cooperation and reiterated his willingness to resolve the matter. Subsequently, on 03.04.2025, Inspector Tej Ram (*petitioner herein*), CIA In-charge, visited the university campus, met the Chairman, and assured him that if he extended support, the matter would be settled and he would be helped to the maximum extent possible.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 08.05.2025. Learned Senior counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question as he was taking up investigation against the complainant-side. Learned Senior counsel has further argued that a bare perusal of the material brought forth on record, including the statement made by the witness under Section 164 of the Cr. P.C. (now Section 183 of the BNSS, 2023) does not point out any inculcate material against the petitioner. Learned Senior counsel has argued that assuming *arguendo*, the prosecution version is taken to be correct, the bribe money of Rs.15 lakhs was handed-over to one Sh. Devender Malik, Advocate, whose statement was recorded on 21.11.2025 under Section 183 of the BNSS, 2023 and perusal thereof reflects that the said money was on account of lawyer's fee. Learned Senior counsel has further submitted that investigation *qua* the petitioner already stands completed and challan has also been presented on 05.07.2025. Learned

CRM-M-41694-2025

Senior counsel has iterated that the petitioner is a man with clean antecedents. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are direct/ serious in nature and, thus, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is a serving police official and is likely to influence the witnesses, in case he is released on bail. Thus, dismissal of the present petition is entreated for. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 10.01.2026, in the Court today, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 08.05.2025 and is in continuous custody since then. It is not in dispute that investigation *qua* the petitioner is complete and challan stands presented on 05.07.2025. Total 20 prosecution witnesses have been cited, out of which, none has been examined till date. It is, thus, indubitable that conclusion of the trial will take its own time. The rival contention raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues, which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, *lest* it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

CRM-M-41694-2025

6.1. As per custody certificate dated 10.01.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 08 months and 03 days, & is not shown to be involved in any other FIR(s).

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell-phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

CRM-M-41694-2025

9. Ordered accordingly.
10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

January 12, 2026
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No