

CRM-M-67725-2025 (O&M)

2026.PHHC.013237



223

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

CRM-M-67725-2025 (O&M)**Date of decision : 29.01.2026****Date of uploading: 29.01.2026**

SANDEEP

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present : Mr. Rahul Shamra, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Vivek K. Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, A.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Ravinder Singh Randhawa, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Mandeep Singh Kundu, Advocate
for the complainant.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, in case bearing FIR No.26 dated 01.08.2025, registered for offences punishable under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Sections 7A, 12, 13(1)(B) read with Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act 1988 and Sections 61(2) and 215 of the BNS, 2023 were added later on), at Police Station Anti-Corruption Bureau, District Rohtak.

2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner is in custody since 01.08.2025. Learned senior counsel has further

CRM-M-67725-2025 (O&M)

submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned senior counsel has further submitted that the genesis of the FIR in question pertain relating to two FIR(s) registered in Delhi in which the FIR-complainant (Vipin Kumar) is not directly connected and the said two FIR(s) are in respect of one Parveen Lakra, who has, till date, not stepped forward to have a statement recorded before the police. Learned senior counsel has further submitted that the petitioner (*herein*) has already given his voice sample. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the investigation *qua* the FIR is already complete and challan stands presented on 26.09.2025. Learned senior counsel has further submitted that the complainant has been procrastinating giving his voice sample to the police on one pretext or the other. Learned senior counsel has further submitted that sanction *qua* co-accused-Inspector Sunil Jain is yet to be received and thus, the trial is unable to proceed further and delay thereof cannot be attributed to the petitioner (*herein*). Learned senior counsel has further submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedents. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

3. Reply by way of an affidavit dated 17.12.2025 has already been filed on behalf of respondent-State of Haryana. Raising submissions in tandem with the said reply, learned State counsel has opposed the grant of regular bail to the petitioner by iterating that the petitioner was caught red handed and, thus, he does not deserve the concession of regular bail. Learned State counsel has further submitted that the call detail record (CDR)/audio recordings of the petitioner (*herein*) clearly reflects his culpability. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody

CRM-M-67725-2025 (O&M)

certificate dated 29.01.2026, in the Court today, which is taken on record.

He has thus sought for dismissal of the petition in hand.

4. Learned senior counsel appearing for the complainant has argued that there are direct/serious allegations against the petitioner. Learned senior counsel has further submitted that in case, the petitioner is accorded the concession of regular bail, there is all the likelihood of the petitioner may abscond from the process of justice as also interfering in the investigation/witnesses. Learned senior counsel has further submitted that the petitioner (*herein*) is trying to have threats extended to the FIR-complainant. On these grounds, dismissal of the petition in hand is prayed for.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the rival parties and have perused the records.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 01.08.2025 and is in custody since then. Upon culmination of the investigation, challan stands presented on 26.09.2025. Total 35 prosecution witnesses have been cited and it is not in dispute before this Court that none has been examined till date, and the charges have not yet been framed, *inter alia*, on account of lack of sanction on behalf of co-accused-Inspector Sunil Jain. It is, thus, indubitable that the conclusion of the trial will take long time. The rival contentions raised at bar give rise to debatable issues, which shall be ratiocinated during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into the same, at this stage, *lest* it may prejudice the rights. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice.

7. As per custody certificate dated 29.01.2026, the petitioner has suffered incarceration for a period of 05 months and 29 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 factual milieu of the case.

8. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, if not required in any other case, 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 cellphone 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/Illaq Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

9. 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.

10. Ordered accordingly.
11. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
12. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

January 29, 2026

gurpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Whether reportable:

(SUMEET GOEL)

JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No