



CRM-M-27613-2024

-1-

201

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

\*\*\*\*

**CRM-M-27613-2024  
Date of Decision: 01.07.2024**

Satbir Singh @ Satbir Gujjar

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present: Mr. Amarsh Dudeja, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kapil Bansal, D.A.G., Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present is a third petition filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.64 dated 07.02.2023, under Sections 506 IPC and Sections 387 & 201 IPC added later on, registered at Police Station Pinjore, District Panchkula.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is in custody for about 11 months and 29 days and the complainant has already been examined and has not supported the prosecution story. He further submitted that it is a case where the petitioner has been falsely implicated and since the material witness has now been examined, the petitioner may be considered for grant of regular bail.

3. On the other hand, Mr. Kapil Bansal, learned DAG, Haryana on instructions, from PSI Sukhbir, who is present in the Court, submitted that

**CRM-M-27613-2024****-2-**

although the custody of the petitioner is 11 months and 29 days but it is a case where the petitioner had made a phone call to the wife of the complainant on her mobile phone and demanded from her an amount of Rs.46 lacs in the form of extortion money. He further submitted that the voice sample has already been sent to the forensic laboratory and the report has not come yet and the mere fact that complainant has turned hostile would not mean that the petitioner can be considered for grant of regular bail. He also submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in as many as 13 other cases, out of which, some of the cases are similar in nature and has also referred to the custody certificate of the petitioner filed in Court today and vehemently opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner. He further submitted that considering the criminal background of the petitioner, there is a reasonable apprehension with the State that in case the petitioner is released on bail, then he may not only abscond or flee from justice but may also repeat the offence and therefore, he may not be granted bail by this Court.

4. I have heard the learned counsels for the parties.

5. It is a case where the petitioner has faced incarceration for 11 months and 29 days and as per the learned counsel for the parties, the complainant has been examined and has not supported the prosecution version. The report of the voice sample has not been received from the forensic laboratory as per the learned State counsel. The petitioner is stated to be involved in 13 more cases as per the custody certificate filed by the learned State counsel in Court today.

6. Considering the seriousness and gravity of the allegations, which have been contained in the FIR pertaining to the alleged extortion of Rs.46 lacs



CRM-M-27613-2024

-3-

and considering the other cases pending against the petitioner and also considering the apprehension which has been so expressed by the learned State Counsel, this Court does not deem it fit and proper to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

7.           Consequently, the present petition is hereby dismissed.
8.           However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on merits of the case and is only meant for the purpose of decision of present petition.

01.07.2024

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)

Bhumika

JUDGE

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