



CRM-M-18423-2026 (O & M)

::1::

(214)

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

**CRM-M-18423-2026 (O & M)**

**Date of Decision: 10.04.2026**

Bharat Meena

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI**

Present: Mr. Vinod Ghai, Sr. Advocate  
Mr. Arnav Ghai, Advocate  
Mr. Jeevanjot S. Kang, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.**

The prayer in the present petition under Section 483 BNSS is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.34 dated 06.12.2025 under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Section 13(1)(b) read with Section 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act added later on), registered at Police Station ACB Rohtak, District State Vigilance & Anti-Corruption Bureau, Haryana.

2. As per the allegations, the petitioner was caught red-handed while accepting an illegal gratification of Rs.2,50,000/- against a total demand of Rs.1,40,00,000/-.

3. The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are baseless. As he is in custody since 06.12.2025 but none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined so far,



**CRM-M-18423-2026 (O & M)**

::2::

the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, contends that the petitioner accepted a huge amount as illegal gratification. The allegations levelled are grave and therefore, he is not entitled to the concession as prayed for. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 06.12.2025 and that none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. The veracity of the prosecution case against the petitioner and his co-accused shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the Trial. Admittedly, the petitioner is in custody since 06.12.2025 but none of the prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial in the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-Bharat Meena is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. The petition stands disposed of.

**(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)**  
**JUDGE**

**April 10, 2026**  
Vishal

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