



256

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

**CRM-M-17853-2025
Date of Decision:07.04.2025**

JITENDER KUMAR

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**Present :** Mr. Navjit Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.0004 dated 14.03.2022, registered under Sections 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Section 7A of PC Act & Section 120-B of IPC added later on) Police Station ACB Ambala, District Anti Corruption Bureau, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Raman Sagra and the same has been reproduced below:-

“Sir, Copy of the complaint is as follow: To, Inspector Vigilance, Ambala City. Sir, I, Raman Sangra s/o Mehar Singh, resident of 671/63, Manav Chonk, Ambala City. After the demise of my grandfather Sadhu Ram mutation (intkal) of his property was



to be done in the name of my father, his brother and sisters And regarding this Smt. Reena Devi daughter of Sushil Kumar, resident of village Sakraho, District Ambala, also had to get the mutation done for her purchased land of 03 Kanal 17 Marla and she had handed over me the documents. Regarding same met Anuj Sharma Patwari District Ambala and Patwari told me that for both work you have to give Rs.10,000/- (ten thousand) per registry as bribe. To which I replied that this it is a huge amount, reduce some amount. Thereafter, Patwari on 11.03.2022 made me talk to his helper Rinku resident of Durana from mobile no. 89011-85231 to my mobile no. 9855736572, Rinku told me that get a good fee I had talked with Patwari. Thereafter, on 13.03.2022 I called the helper Rinku on his mobile from my phone with regard to get the above work done, then Rinku told me that he had talked to Anuj Sharma Patwari, and bring Rs.6,000/- (six thousand) for both works tomorrow i.e. 14.03.2022 in late afternoon at Patwar Khana Ambala City, Patwari Anju Sharma will meet you there. Your work will be done. Today 14.03.2022 I from my mobile no.9855736572 called Patwari Anuj Sharma, and Patwari did not picked up the call. Then in the morning at about 09.05 AM Anuj Patwari called me on my above no. from his mobile no.82210-28008, and in that conversation I told him that as per your instructions I had talked to Rinku for giving Rs. 6,000/- (six thousand), so shall I come today in late afternoon. To which Patwari Anuj Sharma said you are sitting do as you wish. That I don't want to give Rs.6,000/-(six thousand) as bribe to them and if I don't give him this amount then he will not get the intkal done of above both. I want to get them caught red handed while giving this bribe of Rs.6,000/-. I had recording of the above talk with regard to the bribe in my mobile, I have presented a CD of the said recording and had preparing it in your office. That I have presented 12 currency notes of 500-500 amounting Rs.6,000/-. Legal action be taken against both. Date



14.03.2022. Sd/- (in Eng) Raman Sangra s/o Mehar Singh Mob.9855736572.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the allegations levelled by the complainant, the bribe was allegedly demanded by Anuj Sharma, Patwari, who has already been arrested by the police. He further submits that the petitioner had nothing to do with the present case as he is a private person and it has been wrongly alleged that he was working as Assistant with Anuj Sharma, Patwari. He further contends that petitioner was arrested in the present case on 19.12.2024 and the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented against him on 17.02.2025. He further contends that the charge has not been framed against the petitioner and the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that petitioner was working as Assistant unauthorizedly with Anuj Sharma, Patwari and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. However, he submits that the petitioner was never involved in any other crime. He further contends that during the course of investigation the police has recovered an audio recording between the petitioner and the complainant, which clearly shows that the petitioner had also demanded bribe on behalf of Anuj Sharma, Patwari and FSL report corroborates the case of the prosecution.

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

6. The petitioner is in custody in the present case since 19.12.2024 and challan has already been presented against him. The bribe was allegedly



demanding by Anuj Sharma, Patwari, who is stated to be in custody in the present case. The prosecution is yet to lead the evidence with regard to involvement of the petitioner in crime, before the trial Court. Thus, further custody of the petitioner may not serve any useful purpose.

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

07.04.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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