



CRM-M-23656-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

232

CRM-M-23656-2025
Decided on : 16.07.2025

BRIJ LAL DOGRA

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Ruhani Chadha, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok S. Chaudhry, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Suresh Kumar Arya, Advocate, for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

| Name of Petitioner(s) | FIR No. | Date | Section(s) | Police Station | District |
|-------------------------------------|---------|------------|------------|----------------|-----------|
| Brij Lal Dogra, aged about 62 years | 120 | 10.09.2024 | 420 of IPC | Division No.2 | Pathankot |

2. As per the allegations in the FIR, petitioner is accused of demanding a sum of Rs.12 lakhs from the complainant(s), in exchange for securing a job in the Punjab and Haryana High Court. It is alleged that the said amount was paid to the petitioner jointly by the complainants in varying sums of Rs.4 lakhs, Rs.5 lakhs, Rs.1 lakh, and



Rs.2.5 lakhs. However, when the promised job was not arranged by the petitioner, complainant(s) lodged the present FIR against him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the entire allegation is based on the purported payment of cash, with no supporting bank transactions to substantiate the claim. It is contended that the accusations are false and baseless. Furthermore, petitioner is in custody since 06.02.2025, amounting to more than five months of incarceration. Despite the framing of charges on 02.05.2025, only the examination-in-chief of three witnesses has been completed, out of total 22. Conclusion of the trial is expected to take a considerable amount of time.

3. It is further submitted that, though there is no concrete evidence against the petitioner, still assuming the allegations to be true for the sake of argument, complainant(s) himself would be equally complicit in the alleged offence, as they willingly agreed to and paid money in exchange for securing a job in the High Court, an act that is itself, unlawful. Antecedents and conduct of the complainant(s) are also not beyond reproach. Thus, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, has filed status report dated 15.07.2025, and same is ordered to be taken on record.

While opposing the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel submits that petitioner is involved in a serious offence, which not only undermines the integrity of the legal system but also brings disrepute to a highly reputed institution i.e. Punjab and Haryana High Court. It is argued that such acts tarnish the image of



the judiciary and erode public trust, and therefore, petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

5. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties. Admittedly, petitioner was arrested on 06.02.2025 and has remained in custody for more than five months and seven days. Out of total 22 prosecution witnesses, examination-in-chief of only 3 witnesses has been completed, so far. Moreover, whether the alleged amount was actually paid by the complainant(s) or not, is a matter that requires proof by the prosecution, particularly in the light of the petitioner's consistent stand that allegations are false and unsupported by any bank transaction or documentary evidence. Considering the stage of trial and the prolonged custody of the petitioner, this Court finds it appropriate to grant concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

6. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

16.07.2025

Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: ~~YES~~/NO