

216

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

CRM-M-3289-2022

Decided on: 29th March, 2022

Satpal @ Rana

Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. K.L. Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rubal Garg, Advocate for the complainant.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

1. Petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No. 257, dated 28th October, 2021, under Sections 384, 386, 506 read with Section 34 IPC, 201 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Garhi, District Jind (Haryana).

2. As per the allegations of complainant- Jaswinder Singh on 19th October, 2021, he received a call demanding Rupees One Crore ransom. The mobile number from which call was made was mentioned in the FIR. On 26th October, 2021, unknown persons on motorcycle with muffled faces stop the complainant and his wife and threatened for not paying the ransom amount. Accused was allegedly carrying weapon like a pistol type. The role attributed to the petitioner is that SIM which was in the name of Sandeep was provided to the co-accused for making the ransom calls.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was not named in the FIR. It is a case of false implication due to his involvement in another FIR under the Excise Act. Petitioner was nominated on the basis of disclosure statement and thereafter his confessional statement was recorded. The contention is that there is no evidentiary value of the confessional statement. It is further argued that investigation is complete, no further recovery is to be made.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions vehemently opposes the prayer and submits that Sandeep was staying in the house of his in-laws who was known to the petitioner-Satpal @ Rana. Sonu gave the SIM card belonging to Sandeep to petitioner who further provided it to the co-accused.

5. Though the complainant is not impleaded as party, Mr. Rubal Garg, Advocate appeared on behalf of the complainant and opposes the prayer for grant of bail and submits that complainant is in constant fear as he received a ransom call and thereafter was stopped on the road.

6. The observations made hereinafter are only for the purpose of deciding the bail petition and shall not be construed as an opinion on merits of the case.

7. Petitioner was not named in the FIR, his name surfaced in disclosure statement. No further recovery is to be made from the petitioner, petitioner is in custody since 2nd November, 2021, though investigation is complete, conclusion of the trial is likely to take time and personal liberty of the petitioner cannot be deprived due to his involvement in another case, petitioner is granted bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the

satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. The petition is allowed.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

29th March, 2022
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes /No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes /No |