



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

109

CRM-M-29128-2025

Date of decision: May 26th, 2025

Manjit Singh @ Manjeet Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Vipul Babuta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.12 dated 08.05.2025 under Sections 7 of The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, District Ludhiana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case owing to his refusal to succumb to the allegedly illegal demands made by the complainant and his family members in the context of a matrimonial dispute involving the brother of the complainant. It is submitted that the petitioner (a serving police official), in the course of his official duties, had declined to act in a manner that would favor the complainant, which allegedly led the latter to fabricate a false narrative of bribery and lodge a complaint with *mala fide* intent.

3. While drawing the attention of this Court to the FIR (Annexure P-1), learned counsel argued that the allegations therein are

vague, bereft of material particulars as to the time, date, place, or mode of the alleged demand and receipt of illegal gratification. Furthermore, it is asserted that the complainant failed to report the incident promptly or to employ the services of the Vigilance Bureau to lay a trap as per standard procedure, thereby undermining the credibility of the allegations. It is also brought to the attention of this Court that the complainant is allegedly a habitual litigant with a history of making similar allegations against police personnel, which, according to the petitioner casts serious doubt on the veracity of the present complaint.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. H.S. Deol, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent.

6. Learned State counsel however, has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. On instructions, it has been contended by the learned State counsel that the petitioner has been specifically named and implicated in serious allegations involving the demand and receipt of illegal gratification- first, a sum of ₹1,500/- to delay the inquiry, and later, an additional amount of ₹8,000/- to facilitate a compromise in a matrimonial dispute.

7. The learned State counsel has further submitted, on instructions, that the complainant has provided an audio recording in which the petitioner can purportedly be heard soliciting and negotiating the bribe. This recording has been handed over to the Vigilance Bureau and now forms part of the record. As per the learned State counsel, the allegations are not only specific in nature but are also *prima facie* corroborated by the audio evidence, which lends considerable weight to the case of the prosecution.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

9. The allegations against the petitioner are grave and *prima facie* supported by documentary and electronic evidence in the form of an audio recording.

10. Unlike in cases, where vague or bald allegations are made without substantive corroboration, the present case involves specific assertions of demand and acceptance of bribes on two separate occasions, allegedly in exchange for the abuse of official position to influence an ongoing inquiry. The fact that the audio recording has been produced and is under forensic examination further strengthens the version put forth by the prosecution at this preliminary stage.

11. This Court is also mindful of the fact that the grant of the anticipatory bail is an extraordinary remedy to be exercised sparingly and only in exceptional circumstances. In corruption-related offences, particularly, where public servants are accused of leveraging their official status for personal gain, the threshold for such indulgence is necessarily higher. The allegations, if proven, strike at the root of public trust in law enforcement agencies.

12. In the totality of the circumstances, and considering the seriousness and specificity of the allegations, coupled with the preliminary material collected during investigation, this Court finds no ground to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

13. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

14. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

May 26th, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No