



Himachal Pradesh for taking number of Punjab State, | submitted NOC along with other documents in the office of RTO Pathankot. Thereafter, I deposited online Tax Rs. 20727/- on 12.12.2024. For getting the online approval of RC, Jatinder Singh (JD) and Mukesh Sharma, Data Entry Operator working in the office of RTO Pathankot demanded Rs. 5500/- as bribe. I told them that I have deposited the government fee and therefore I can't pay Rs. 5500/- as bribe but Clerk, Jatinder Singh (JD) and Data Entry Operator Mukesh Sharma told me that if you do not pay this bribe money then your file will not be approved. I do not want to pay bribe and Today I have come in the office of Vigilance Bureau Pathankot and produced currency notes of Rs. 5500/-. Legal action be taken against Clerk, Jatinder Singh (D) and Data Entry Operator Mukesh Sharma working in the Office of RTO, Pathankot. Statement has been heard and is correct. -Sd/- Surjit Kuma.,”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that at the relevant time, the petitioner was working as a Data Entry Operator in the office of Regional Transport Authority, Pathankot. In fact, it has been falsely alleged that the petitioner has raised a demand of Rs.5,500/- from the complainant. In fact, he had no reason to demand bribe as he had got nothing to do with the approval process. Moreover, the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 16.12.2024 and is in custody since then. Learned counsel further contends that in the present case, the prosecution has been able to examine only 01 witness, out of total 13 witnesses cited by the prosecution. Thus, the trial may not conclude in near future.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been leveled against the present petitioner and he does



not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. However, he admits that the petitioner is a first offender and was never involved in any other criminal case.

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

6. In the present case, the petitioner is in custody since 16.12.2024 i.e. for the last about 08 months. The prosecution is yet to lead evidence to prove the involvement of the petitioner in the crime, only during the course of trial. However, before the trial Court, only one witness has been examined so far and the trial may not conclude in near future.

7. Without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on his furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

06.08.2025

hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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