

CRM-M-55462-2025

2026:PHHC:001659



230

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-55462-2025**

Satish Kumar

....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. Shivam Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG Haryana.

***********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.20 dated 14.07.2025, for the offence punishable under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (challaned under Sections 7, 13(1)(B) & 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act), registered at Police Station ACB, Faridabad.

2. The gravamen of allegations against the petitioner is that on 14.07.2025, Inspector Santram of the State Vigilance and Anti-Corruption Bureau, Faridabad, received directions from senior officers to reach the District Court, Palwal to verify a complaint and conduct raiding proceedings. After obtaining the gazetted officer appointment order from the

CRM-M-55462-2025

Superintendent of Police, the concerned gazetted officer was contacted and instructed to reach the court premises along with a government employee. A raiding team comprising Inspector Ravindra Kumar, SI Sanjeev Kumar, SI Brijpal, SI Charanjeet, EHC Manoj Kumar, Ct. Ombir, and EHC Pritam was constituted and reached the parking area of the District Court, Palwal. Hitesh Kumar, XEN, Mechanical Division, Irrigation Department, Faridabad, was present there with his driver Shiv Kumar, who was appointed as the shadow witness. Inspector Santram then contacted the complainant Shri Lalit Bindal, who called him to Advocate Chamber No.312, Palwal. The raiding team reached the said chamber, where the complainant was present and was introduced to the gazetted officer and the shadow witness. The complaint was verified by Inspector Santram and the gazetted officer.

The complainant alleged that Satish Kumar (*petitioner herein*), clerk/accountant at the Market Committee, Palwal, had demanded and accepted illegal gratification for processing the transfer of allotment letters and issuance of completion certificates in respect of Booth Nos.271 and 272, New Sabzi Mandi, Palwal, which belonged to his aunt Smt. Rajrani Bindal and were transferred to her grandson, namely, Ram Bindal. An initial bribe of ₹50,000/- had already been paid, followed by further demands of ₹60,000/-, and later ₹1,20,000/-, claiming that part of the amount was for the Market Committee Secretary and threatening imposition of a heavy fine.

On the same day, the complainant and his nephew met the accused, and the bribe amount was settled at ₹1,30,000/-. The complainant expressed unwillingness to pay the bribe and informed that he had recorded

CRM-M-55462-2025

the conversation regarding the demand of illegal gratification on his mobile phone.

On the basis of these allegations, an FIR in question was registered and information was conveyed to senior officers. Thereafter, a raid was conducted in Advocate Chamber No.312, search of the complainant was carried out in the presence of the gazetted officer, and further legal proceedings were undertaken. Upon collecting sufficient evidence, Satish Kumar (*petitioner herein*) was arrested in the present case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 14.07.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has iterated that there is no recovery of any money directly from the petitioner, but it is the case of the prosecution that money was placed into the dash-board of the car of the petitioner, which, in-fact, was placed by the complainant so as to trap the petitioner. Learned counsel has further iterated that in any case, the challan already stands presented and the trial will take long time. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 10.01.2026 and reply by way of an affidavit dated 08.01.2026 of Surender Kumar HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, State Vigilance & Anti Corruption Bureau, Faridabad, in the Court today, which are taken on record. Raising submissions in tandem with the said reply, learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the

CRM-M-55462-2025

allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and, thus, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail.

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

6. The petitioner was arrested on 14.07.2025 whereinafter investigation was carried out and challan has been presented on 11.09.2025. 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.

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 05 months & 27 days. Further, as per the said custody certificate, the appellant is stated to be involved in other FIR(s). However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the appellant in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586***, a

CRM-M-55462-2025

Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of *Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477* & judgments of this Court in CRM-M No.38822-2022 titled as *Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana*, decided on 29.11.2021, and *Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191*.

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

CRM-M-55462-2025

State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

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