



2026:AHC:58328

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION No. - 5778 of 2026

Ravinder Mehta

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P.

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Katyayini, Rajrshi Gupta, Sr. Advocate
Counsel for Opposite Party(s):	:	G.A.

Court No. - 53

HON'BLE SAMIT GOPAL, J.

1. List revised.

2. Heard Sri Dileep Kumar, learned Senior Advocate assisted by Ms. Katyayini, learned counsel for the applicant and Sri Birendra Pratap Singh, learned counsel for the State and perused the material on record.

3. This bail application under Section 483 of B.N.S.S., 2023 has been filed by the applicant- **Ravinder Mehta**, seeking enlargement on bail during trial in connection with Case Crime No. 231 of 2025, under Section 7 Prevention of Corruption Act,, Police Station Adarsh Mandi, District Shamli.

4. The facts of the case are that an application dated 05.12.2025 was given by Mahesh Kumar the original complainant in the office of Superintendent of Police, U.P., Vigilance Department, Meerut Sector, Meerut that he has purchased 26 bigha land in the name of his wife Sangeeta and bhabhi Neelam for Rs. 90 Lakhs on 15.06.2024 showing the value of land of Rs. 1,04,20,000/-. As per the circle rate Rs. 5,01,500/- stamp duty was paid on it. A notice dated 12.12.2024 from the Stamp Commissioner, Collector Stamp, Shamli in the name of his wife Sangeeta and bhabhi Neelam was received in which the value of the land was shown in the slab of Rs. 25,38,000/- and stamp duty was demanded on it and an inspection was done after which the location was found different on which less stamp duty was paid. Later on a notice dated 13.02.2025 was received in response of

which the original complainant through his lawyer presented his case. After many dates being fixed subsequent to the notice and no decision being taken he went along with his nephew Vardaan on 24.11.2025 to the office of Assistant Stamp Commissioner, Shamli Ravinder Mehta and met him and enquired about the disposal of the said notice on which he instructed him to meet his clerk Ashwani and talk to him after which his work would be done otherwise he would keep on running like this. When both the persons went and met the clerk Ashwani they were told that less stamp duty has been paid and Rs. 3,80,000/- stamp duty is to be paid and Rs. 1,00,000/- has to be paid as bribe otherwise stamp duty of market rate has to be given. He said that he would talk to the officer concerned and get the case decided. The complainant then showed his hardship of not able to give the money on which his clerk told him to come after a week and then he would again talk to the officer concerned for reducing the amount but the bribe of Rs. 1,00,000/- has to be given in full. Later on the original complainant along with his nephew again went on 02.12.2025 to meet the clerk Ashwani who told them that he has talked to the officer and he has stated that stamp duty of Rs. 1,60,000/- be given in addition of Rs. 1,00,000/- to be given as bribe and they may come tomorrow to meet him. The original complainant came on the next day i.e. 03.12.2025 and along with the clerk Ashwani meet Ravinder Mehta, the Assistant Stamp Commissioner, Shamli wherein Ravinder Mehta heard their complaint and stated that their work will be settled in 50% of the amount and told them to further talk to Ashwani and he will tell him about it. Ashwani then told them that the officer had initially ask for Rs. 1,00,000/- as bribe and additional stamp duty shall be decided by him on the date in the matter which shall be deposited then. The original complainant does not want to give bribe money to Ravinder Mehta and his clerk Ashwani but wants them to be arrested. On his complaint pre-trap proceedings were done and a trap was decided to be led. Two independent persons were directed to be members of the trap team by the District Magistrate, Muzaffarnagar. The original complainant then gave two bundles of Rs. 500/- to the clerk Ashwani which was kept by him in his pocket after which he asked for some money for him. The complainant then requested that he would talk to the officer for the work. He then told him that he would ask the officer for getting

the work. The complainant then went inside and stated that he has given the money to clerk Ashwani after which the person sitting in front said he would see for the work. He assured him for the best to be done. The clerk Ashwani was apprehended accepting Rs. 1,00,000/- as bribe. A recovery memo and arrest memo was prepared. The present first information report has thus been lodged in the present matter.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that there is no independent witness to corroborate the prosecution story. It is further submitted that although charge-sheet in the matter has been submitted but sanction for prosecution against the applicant is still awaited, he has placed page 22 of the second supplementary affidavit dated 16.02.2026 for the same. It is submitted that trap in the present matter was laid at 13:10 hours but the first information report has been lodged at 21:49 hours which is after about 08 hours & 30 minutes and there is no explanation for the delay in lodging of the first information report. It is submitted that the entire proceedings of trap were done at the police station and thus the sanctity of the same is in serious doubt. It is submitted that the applicant was posted as Assistant Inspector General of Registration / Assistant Commissioner of Stamp in District Shamli. Learned counsel has further placed before the Court the judgement of this Court in **Criminal Appeal No. 2224 of 2024 (Ashish Mishra Vs. State of U.P. and Another)** decided on 15.05.2025 and **Criminal Misc. Bail Application No. 34833 of 2022 (Subhash Patel Vs. State of U.P.)** decided on 16.11.2022 and submitted that this Court has considered the fact that proceedings were done at the police station and thus in the previous case acquitted the accused-appellant whereas in the second case granted him bail. The applicant has no criminal history as stated in para 37 and is in jail since 09.12.2025.

6. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the proceedings in the present matter are trap proceedings. It is submitted that there is demand and acceptance of bribe money and thus the chain gets completed. It is submitted that there were two independent witnesses in the matter duly nominated by the District Magistrate concerned who were present at the time of

raid. It is submitted that the recovery in the present matter of Rs. 1,00,000/- which is a huge amount and the applicant is Government servant before whom the case of the original complainant was pending for which he was given notice regarding the deficiency of stamp duty in a document duly submitted for registration. It is submitted that the charge-sheet in the matter has been submitted after thorough investigation. It is submitted that in the case of Ashish Mishra (supra) the said matter was after trial in which evidence was led and more so the Court had extended the benefit of doubt to the accused and allowed the appeal whereas in the other case being Subhash Patel (supra) the bail was granted to him in which the amount of bribe money was Rs. 5000/- and thus both the matters stand on distinguishing feature with that of the present matter. It is submitted that the present case is a case of bribe and thus the bail application of the applicant be rejected.

7. After having heard learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is evident that the applicant was posted as Assistant Inspector General of Registration / Assistant Commissioner of Stamp in District Shamli. The document of registration in the name of wife and relative of the original complainant was put to notice on the ground of deficiency of stamp duty. The matter was before the applicant as being the competent officer to look before it. There was a demand of bribe for settling the matter on payment of some reduce amount of stamp duty. Rs. 1,00,000/- was paid on the said demand. The amount as paid is a huge amount. There are specific reasons given in the first information report as to why the proceedings were taken up at the police station. There are two independent witnesses nominated by the District Magistrate concerned who were members of the trap team. No ground for bail is made out.

8. Looking to the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not find it a fit case for bail, hence, the bail application is **rejected**.

9. Pending application (s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

March 20, 2026
AS Rathore

(Smit Gopal,J.)