



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

219/2

**CRM-M No.61124 of 2025
Date of decision : 28.1.2026
Date of uploading : 28.1.2026**

Sonu @ Sonu Kumar**Petitioner**
Versus
State of Haryana**Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Rakesh Kumar Lathwal, Advocate, for the petitioner
Ms. Priyanka Sadar, Senior DAG, Haryana

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. 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 bearing FIR No.14 dated 26.5.2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 409, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC and Sections 13(1)(c) and 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, registered at Police Station Anti-Corruption Rohtak, District Anti Corruption Bureau.

2. The gravamen of the FIR in question is that Inspector Rohtash Kumar, Anti Corruption Bureau, Sub Centre Jhajjar presented a complaint to the Superintendent of Police, Anti Corruption Bureau, Rohtak Division, as per letter no.4032/complaint/27/Rohtak dated 30.01.2024 of the office of Director General, Anti Corruption Bureau, Rohtak Division, after



verification analysis of the received above-said complaint and letter no.489/CC/ACB/Rohtak dated 29.02.2024 Superintendent of Police, Anti Corruption Bureau, Rohtak. The said complaint is given by Aman Pandey, Value Creator, Plot NO.37, Industrial Area, Bahadurgarh through registered post regarding for the wrongful transfer of more than Rs.1 crore related to compensation amount for land acquisition of Village Kasar, Tehsil Bahadurgarh to Sunil's bank account by Sonu Patwari, Joginder Patwari and Kulwant Kanoongo in collusion with each other. During verification and analysis of the complaint, the address given by the complainant, Aman Pandey, Value Creator, Plot No.37, Industrial Area, Bahadurgarh was incorrect. In the year 2003, the land of Village Kasar, Jakhoda and Sankhaul was acquired by the Haryana Government for HSIIDC Bahadurgarh, the payment of which was made by the Office of the District Revenue Officer, Jhajjar. A case has been instituted in the Court of Sh. M.C. Mehta, Ld. Addl. District Judge, Jhajjar for enhancement of the compensation by the land owners of Village Kasar, Jakhoda and Sankhol. The said case was decided and judgment delivered on 24.03.2009. The landowners were dissatisfied with the judgment and for the enhancement of compensation, an appeal (RFA No.3787 of 2011) has been filed in the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court titled as Gaje Singh etc. vs. State of Haryana, which was decided in favour of land owners on 06.11.2015. Thereafter, an APR (Amount Paid Register) was prepared by the HSIIDC Department, Bahadurgarh and sent to the District Revenue Officer and Land Acquisition Collector, Jhajjar. Then the



amount related to land acquisition was transferred into the landowners' accounts by the District Revenue Officer and Land Acquisition Collector, Jhajjar. Rishipal, Harpal and Vijaypal Solanki son of Sh. Nayadar Singh son of Sh. Ami Lal, resident of Dabari, New Delhi instituted a case regarding the compensation of land acquisition through LAC No.305/2005/2008 in the Court of Sh. M.C.Mehta, the then Ld. Addl. District Judge, Jhajjar. Thereafter, an appeal RFA No.3787 of 2011 titled as 'Gaje Singh etc, vs. State of Haryana' was preferred in the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh. As per record, LAC No.305/2005/2008 related to the land of the Village Kasar in Khewat no.15, 16 and killa no.7//23/2, 7//24, 12/14/2, 4/1, 3 measuring a total land of 27 kanal 6 marla was owned by Rishipal, Harpal, Vijaypal. Rishipal and Harpal said that they have received the compensation for the above land twice. However, they did not receive the compensation amount for the third time. The APR (Amount Paid Register) related to enhance amount of land acquisition first prepared in the name of Rishipal, Harpal and Vijaypal by HSIIDC Department and thereafter, Sonu Patwari HSIIDC Bahadurgarh in collusion with HSIIDC Department and office of District Revenue Officer and Land Acquisition Collector employees and Officers without any official document, an APR (Amount Paid Register) was prepared in the name of Sunil Kumar son of Sh. Raj Singh, resident of Village Chimni, Tehsil Beri, District Jhajjar, temporary address Flat No.21, South Avenue, near Teen Murti, New Delhi. The District Revenue Officer and Land Acquisition Collector, Jhajjar transferred the amount of



Rs.1,08,74,568/- into Sunil Kumar's bank account bearing account no.917010077746892 on 12.01.2018. In the above incident, Sonu, the then Patwari HSIIDC Bahadurgarh and Sunil Kumar son of Sh. Raj Singh, resident of Village Chimni, Tehsil Beri, District Jhajjar, temporary address Flat No.21, South Avenue, near Teen Murti, New Delhi, apart from the other employees of office HSIIDC Bahadurgarh, office of District Revenue Officer and Land Acquisition Collector, Jhajjar and other private person is likely to be involved. Hence, Sonu Patwari HSIIDC Bahadurgarh and Sunil Kumar son of Sh. Raj Singh by conspiring with each other prepared false documents fraudulently and misusing official position and embezzling the amount of Rs.1,08,74,568/-.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the petitioner is in custody since 24.6.2025. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further submitted that the case in hand pertains to primarily documentary evidence and challan already stands presented. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is a man with clean antecedents. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 26.1.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the rival parties and have gone through



the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 24.6.2025 whereinafter investigation was carried out and challan stands presented on 22.9.2025. Total 28 prosecution witnesses have been cited, and it is not in dispute before this Court that none has been examined till date. It is thus indubitable that culmination of 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 26.1.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 6 months and 25 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.

9. Ordered accordingly.

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

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

28.1.2026
Ashwani

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