


HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 5682/2026

Dinesh Goel S/o Late Shri Kedar Lal Goel, Aged About 56 Years,
R/o 63, Hathroi Fort, G.P.O. Jaipur, Incumbent Chief Engineer
(Administration), P.H.E.D., Jaipur. (At Present Accused Confined
In Central Jail, Jaipur).

----Petitioner

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through PP

----Respondent

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Pankaj Gupta with
Mr. Sandeep Khyaliya,
Mr. Naman Yadav,
Mr. Saurabh Yadav,
Mr. Harshit Bhatt and
Ms. Stuti Dave

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Rajesh Choudhary, GA-cum-AAG
with Mr. Vinod Kumar Sharma,
Mr. Vijay Yadav, AGA
Mr. Onkar Singh Rajpurohit, Dy. GA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI CHIRANIA

Order

1.	Date of conclusion of Arguments	27.05.2026
2.	Date on which the judgment was reserved	27.05.2026
3.	Whether the full judgment or only operative part is pronounced	Full
4.	Date of pronouncement	01.06.2026

1. The petitioner Dinesh Goel S/o Late Shri Kedar Lal Goel has filed the instant bail application, who was working and posted as Chief Engineer and was a Member of the Bid Evaluation Committee (hereinafter to be referred as '**BEC**'), was arrested by the police on 17.02.2026 in connection with the FIR bearing No.245/2024 dated 30.10.2024 registered at Police Station Pradhan Arakshi Kendra, Anti Corruption Bureau, District Jaipur,

for the offence punishable under Sections 7(C), 9, 10, 13(1)(a) read with Section 13(2), 12 of Prevention of Corruption, (Amendment) Act, 2018 and Sections 409, 466, 467, 468, 471, 477A, 120B of IPC, 1860. The petitioner initially approached the learned Trial court by way of bail application which came to be rejected vide order dated 07.03.2026.

2. Mr. Pankaj Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was working and posted as Chief Engineer (Special Projects) in the PHED and was just a member of the BEC. The complete case, as set up by the respondent-ACB, is that five tenders as involved in the case (in respect of the petitioner) were processed by the BEC in complete disregard of the complaints dated 16.02.2023, 16.03.2023 and 20.03.2023 as received from one Padam Singh and legal notices received from one Adv. Mahesh Kalwania regarding the submission of fake certificates of IRCON Ltd. for procuring the tenders by two firms. He further submitted that he was just one of the members of the BEC and has not played any active role in any scam as alleged by the respondent-ACB by the impugned FIR.

3. Learned counsel specifically submitted that though the Department received two complaints, as mentioned above, however, in order to verify those complaints and allegations of fake certificates, senior most Executive Engineer of the Department, namely, Mr. Vishal Saxena, who was specifically sent to Kerala for this purpose. Mr. Vishal Saxena physically visited, verified and submitted his report that the certificates are genuine and there was nothing wrong in them. It is on the basis of the report of the said Executive Engineer, the Department further

processed the tender, that too after withdrawal of the legal notices by the Adv. Mahesh Kalwania by his withdrawal notice dated 17.04.2023, therefore, no illegality was committed by the petitioner herein being member of BEC, as his act was clearly based on the report submitted by the person Mr. Vishal Saxena.

4. Learned counsel specifically submitted that once an officer of the level of Executive Engineer submits any report, there can be no basis not to rely upon and believe the same until and unless the same is proved otherwise. He does not dispute the fact that later on it came out that the said person did not submit correct report about the certificates, therefore, for the act and conduct of the said person, the petitioner cannot be held responsible for the alleged scam in respect of the tenders as alleged by ACB in the FIR.

5. Learned counsel submitted that there are multiple FIRs, for the same incident and in terms of the law as laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***T.T. Anthony Vs. State of Kerala*** reported in **2001(6) SCC 181**, the complete act of respondent of registering the FIR impugned in this bail itself becomes illegal.

6. Lastly, learned counsel, Mr. Pankaj Gupta submitted that ACB after conducting the detailed investigation has filed charge-sheet running into more than 16,000 pages and petitioner is behind the bars since 17.02.2026, no recovery is required and further, no custodial interrogation is required to be made, therefore, the petitioner deserves to be enlarged on bail in the given facts and circumstances of the case.

7. **In response**, Mr. Rajesh Choudhary, GA-cum-AAG along with **Mr. Vijay Singh Yadav**, Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the bail application.

8. Learned GA-cum-AAG submitted that the **petitioner, who was a Chief Engineer (Special Projects) was Chairman of the BEC and, therefore, at the initial stage he was aware about such manipulations in the tender process by those firms, namely, M/s Ganpati Tubewell Company and M/s Shyam Tubewell Company.** The petitioner was not just the Chairman of the BEC, but was also a part of the Finance Committee, whose meetings were held on 02.05.2023 and 09.05.2023 and, therefore, he was an active member in the entire process of the five tenders as involved in this case (in respect of the petitioner), in respect of which the ACB registered the impugned FIR. In view of the above, it is lastly concluded that as no official has been enlarged on bail by any Court in the entire scam, therefore the present bail application also deserves to be dismissed in the given facts and circumstances of the case.

9. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

10. In the present bail application, this Court noted that petitioner was working and posted as **Chief Engineer (Special Projects) and he was the chairman of the BEC, which is the first Committee which first started the process of evaluating the bids.** It was the duty of the BEC to scrutinize all the documents at the initial stage. Despite receipt of all the serious complaints dated 16.02.2023 from one Padam Singh and legal notices dated 16.03.2023 and 20.03.2023 from Adv. Mahesh Kalwaniya through his client, the manner and method in which the

tenders were examined and processed shows serious involvement of the petitioner herein in the entire process. This Court further noted that petitioner was not only the Chairman of the BEC but also one of the members of the Finance Committee whose meetings took place on 02.05.2023 and 09.05.2023. Though the petitioner is behind the bars from 17.02.2026 and charge-sheet has been filed against 13 persons, but no Court has enlarged on bail any co-accused who is behind the bars in connection with the impugned FIR, till date.

11. After noticing the overall facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the present petitioner on bail at this stage.

12. In view of the above this bail application is dismissed.

(RAVI CHIRANIA),J

/Dushyant