



216

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

CRM-M-16206-2024

Date of Decision:- 06.08.2024

MAHENDER SINGH

....Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM:-HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. S.S. Bhinder, Advocate with Ms. Indira, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Birinder Pal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J. (Oral)

1. At the outset, learned counsel for petitioner submits that Section 386 IPC was deleted and Section 387 IPC has been added during investigation, therefore, he made verbal request that said amendment be done in head note and prayer clause of petition.

2. Registry is directed to make necessary changes accordingly in the head note and prayer clause of the instant petition.

Main petition

3. The petitioner – Mahender Singh has filed the instant petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in FIR No.30 dated 16.02.2024 under Sections 386 and 506 IPC, (deleted Section 386 and added Section 387 IPC) registered at Police Station City Sri Muktsar



Sahib, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

4. Brief facts of the case are that Sandeep Kumar complainant stated that on 07.02.2024 at about 11 pm, he received a call from mobile No.99140-64192 and the said caller claimed that he is from Lawrance Group and demanded ransom of Rs.30 lakhs for his safety and safety of his family members. The said call was received everyday at about 10 pm. The calls and messages were saved and recorded. During this time, he noticed that his employee Sukhdeep @ Sukhi @ Satnam Singh used to behave in a strange manner and he got suspicious. Later-on he found that Sandeep @ Sukhi used to meet Mahinder Singh and both of them used to give threatening call demanding ransom. With these allegations, present FIR has been registered.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that matter has been compromised with the complainant and on the basis of compromise for quashing of present FIR, CRM-M-28176-2024 has been filed in which parties have been directed to appear before the trial Court for recording of their statements. No money whatsoever either in cash or in Bank account has been received by petitioner. Complainant has not levelled any allegation of giving money to petitioner. The present petitioner will abide by the terms of bail order. It is submitted that his regular bail application may be allowed.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel filed status report. It is pointed out that there are specific allegation against petitioner. He has given threatening call as well as messages to complainant for ransom. Allegations are serious in nature. He prayed for dismissal of regular bail application.



7. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. Co-accused Sukhdeep Singh @ Sukhi @ Satnam Singh has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 12.07.2024 while relying on copy of order dated 30.05.2024 passed in “CRM-M-28176-2024 titled Mahender Singh and another Vs. State of Punjab and another”, wherein it is recorded that parties have reconciled and petition has been filed for quashing of FIR wherein parties are directed to appear before the trial Court for recording of their statements. The factum of compromise is also not denied by learned counsel for the respondent.

8. Considering the aforesaid factual position, the regular bail application filed by the present petitioner Mahender Singh is allowed. He is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Judge.

9. The petition stands accepted.

10. Pending application (s) if any also stands disposed of.

06.08.2024

snd

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No.

Whether reportable: Yes/No