



2026:PHHC:097846

2026:PHHC:097846



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

126

CRM-M-36774-2026

Date of decision: 17.07.2026

Date of uploading: 17.07.2026

Narinder Singh

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. Paramvir Singh Parmar, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sandeep Gahlawat, Advocate, for the complainant.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.17 dated 07.12.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 7 & 7A of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and Sections 61 & 308(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station State Vigilance & Anti-Corruption Bureau, Panchkula, Haryana.

2. The case set up in the FIR in question (as set out by the petitioner in the present petition) is as follows:-

"I, Nitin, son of the late Shri Rajesh Kumar, resident of village Aasan, District Rohtak, and currently residing in a rented house at House Number 68-G, Ground Floor, Dream Home, Kishanpura, Dhakoli, work in house maintenance. On 05.12.2025, I was travelling from Jind to Panchkula in my car when on the way. I received a call on my mobile phone number 9068134567 from a person named Paras calling from his mobile phone number



9779115214. Paras informed me that the E.O. Wing, Sector-12, Panchkula Police had detained a person named Abhishek and my friend Rahul Aggarwal, a resident of City Heights, Peer Muchalla, Dhakoli, District Mohali, in connection with a loan fraud case.

Paras also told me that he was with Rahul and the Investigating Officer (L.O.) of the case is Sub-Inspector Zora Singh. He mentioned that if Rahul pays 7 lakh rupees, a weak case would be prepared against him to help him out, ensuring his quick release and that he would not be subjected to physical assault. If the 7 lakh rupees are not paid, multiple additional cases will be registered against Rahul. Paras then made me talk to Rahul through his own phone, who somehow requested me to arrange the 7 lakh rupees and hand it over to Zora Singh through Paras. At that time, I gave evasive answers to Paras to put him off, but he kept calling me repeatedly and also made me talk to Rahul. Consequently, yesterday I went to the E.O. Wing, Sector-12, Panchkula, where Paras introduced me to Rahul, who was in police custody. Rahul told me that he had also asked several other acquaintances through Paras's phone to arrange money so that the 7 lakh rupees could be given to the police. Promising to return it to me later, he asked me to arrange 1.50 to 2 lakh rupees and give it to Paras.

Paras also introduced me to I.O. Zora Singh, who told me to go outside and settle the arrangement with Paras. Upon continuous pressure from Paras, yesterday I handed over 50 thousand rupees to Paras outside the E.O. Wing, who, right in front of my eyes, went inside and gave it to an employee named Narendra Singh. After that, Paras told me that he was initially trying to settle Rahul's matter for just 3 lakh rupees, but Rahul did not listen to him, and now he will have to pay 7 lakh rupees. Out of this, a recovery will be shown against Rahul, and the remainder will be the police bribe.

When I expressed my inability to pay more money, Paras asked me to pay 1.50 to 2 lakh rupees in instalments, out of which Paras has called me today to bring 75,000/- rupees. Rahul's father passed away about one to one and a half months ago, and I do not feel this injustice against him is right. I do not want to give this bribe to the police and Paras, and want to catch them red-handed. I have also recorded Paras, which I will present to you later. Legal action should be taken.”



3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 12.05.2026. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question, as the petitioner was an Investigating Officer in an FIR registered against one Paras Aggarwal (who is a friend of the present FIR-complainant). Learned counsel has further urged that the Investigating Officer of the FIR in question, for which the illegal gratification was demanded for, was being investigated by SI Jora Singh and not by the present petitioner. He has further urged that in any case, upon culmination of investigation challan stands presented and conclusion of trial will take long. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and, thus, he does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 12.07.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

4.1 Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and in case the petitioner is extended the concession of bail, there is all the likelihood that he may interfere with the investigation as also intimidate the witnesses and also the FIR-complainant.

5. I have heard counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available records of the case.



6. The petitioner was arrested on 12.05.2026 whereinafter upon culmination of investigation challan stands presented on 26.05.2026. Total 20 witnesses have been cited, out of which none has been examined till date, as charges are yet to be framed and thus, conclusion of trial will take long. The rival contentions raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues, which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

As per custody certificate dated 12.07.2026 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 02 months & is stated to be involved in one more FIR. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586***; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of ***Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477*** & judgments of this Court in ***CRM-M No.38822-2022*** titled as ***Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana***, decided on 29.11.2021, and ***Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191***.



Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cellphone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

8.1. The complainant, in case he feels appropriate, may approach the Commissioner of Police, Panchkula for grant of security. In case any representation is made by the FIR-complainant for grant of security, the same shall be looked into, in accordance with law, expeditiously.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.



CRM-M-36774-2026

2026:PHHC:097846

11. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

17.07.2026

Naveen

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No