

CNR No:PHHC010858792026
2026:PHHC:103083



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

(204)

**CRM-M-29489-2026
Decided on: 27.07.2026
Uploaded on: 27.07.2026**

Nirmal Singh @ Nimma

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Kashav Chadha, Advocate for the petitioner (s).

Mr. Jaypreet Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Sumeet Goel (Oral):

1. Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.217 dated 27.09.2025 registered at Police Station Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran, under Sections 308(3), 308(4), 308(5) and 111 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 25(5) and 25(6) of the Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking pre-arrest bail.

2. On 11.06.2026, the following order was passed:

“By way of the present petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.217 dated 27.09.2025 registered at Police Station Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran under Sections 308(3), 308(4), 308(5) and 111 of the

Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 25(5) and 25(6) of the Arms Act, 1959.

2. As per the status report filed by the State, a police party was on patrol duty on 27.09.2025, when a secret information was received to the effect that the petitioner-Nirmal Singh along with co-accused Sukhdev Singh @ Bhima, Sharanjit Singh @ Baba, Gurpreet Singh @ Goli, Varinder Singh @ Goldy and 10-15 other gangsters was moving in the area armed with weapons and was planning to commit offences. It was further alleged that the aforesaid persons used to threaten members of the public through WhatsApp calls and mobile numbers obtained by fraudulent means, demanding ransom and, in the event of non-payment, resorted to firing upon their houses and shops. Finding the information to be reliable, the present FIR came to be registered.

3. During the course of investigation, co-accused Sukhdev Singh @Bhima was arrested and allegedly suffered a disclosure statement wherein he admitted the allegations and nominated the petitioner as one of the members of the gang. It has further been stated that one Jashandeep Singh made a statement under Section 183 of the BNSS alleging that he had received repeated calls from a particular mobile number and that on 01.10.2025 the caller, introducing himself as Amritpal Singh, demanded a ransom amount of 20,00,000/- and threatened him with death in the event of non-payment.

4. It is not disputed that the investigation now stands concluded, challan has been presented before the competent Court, the case has been committed to the Court of Sessions and charges have already been framed. The matter is presently fixed for prosecution evidence.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated and that his involvement is sought to be established merely on the basis of secret information and the disclosure statement of a co-accused. It is argued that no independent incriminating material has been collected during investigation connecting the petitioner with the alleged offences. Learned counsel further submits that even the statement of Jashandeep Singh was recorded subsequently and that no independent FIR or complaint was lodged by him with regard to

the alleged demand of ransom. It is further argued that the investigating agency has failed to collect any material linking the petitioner with the mobile number from which the alleged threatening calls were made. On these premises, it is submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not warranted and that he is willing to join and cooperate with the investigation.

6. Upon instructions from the Investigating Officer and on the basis of the status report, learned State counsel fairly concedes that except for the secret information and the disclosure statement of the co-accused, no independent evidence has surfaced against the petitioner during investigation. It is also not disputed that no separate FIR was registered at the instance of any person who allegedly received such threatening calls demanding ransom.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the controversy, this Court finds that the implication of the petitioner, at this stage, primarily rests upon the secret information and the disclosure statement of a co-accused. Prima facie, no material has been brought to the notice of this Court showing any direct nexus of the petitioner with the mobile number allegedly used for making ransom calls or with any specific overt act in furtherance of the alleged offences. Significantly, the investigation has already been completed, challan has been filed and the trial has commenced with framing of charges. In such circumstances, the necessity for custodial interrogation of the petitioner does not presently appear to be made out. The petitioner has also expressed his willingness to join the investigation and abide by any condition imposed by this Court.

8. Accordingly, matter is adjourned to 02.07.2026.

9. In the meantime, in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer, subject to the following conditions:-

(i) The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall cooperate with the Investigating Agency in all respects;

- (ii) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly induce, threaten or influence any witness or any person acquainted with the facts of the case;*
- (iii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the competent Court; and*
- (iv) The petitioner shall comply with all the conditions stipulated under Section 482(2) of the BNSS, 2023.”*

2.1. Thereafter, on 02.07.2026, the following order was passed:

“Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not able to join investigation in terms of interim protection afforded to him vide order dated 11.6.2024 as his infant son was not well. He seeks another opportunity to do so.

In the interest of justice, the petitioner is now directed to appear before the concerned Investigating Officer in the concerned Police Station at 11:00 a.m. on 7.7.2026 wherein he shall join investigation in terms of order dated 11.6.2024, earlier passed by this Court.

List on 27.7.2026.

Interim order to continue till then.”

3. Learned State counsel (on instructions) has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation.

4. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand, especially the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation, the petition is allowed and the order dated 11.06.2026 granting interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner is hereby made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

5. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be

confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

6. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

7. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

27.07.2026
Naveen

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No