

CRM-M-42109-2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-42109-2024
Reserved on: 04.11.2024
Pronounced on: 07.11.2024

Gurmeet Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Amit Agnihotri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhdev Singh, AAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
60	06.04.2023	Division No.6, District Jalandhar	387, 389, 506, 509, 120-B IPC

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 439 CrPC, 1973, seeking regular bail.
2. As per paragraph 16 of the bail petition, the accused has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1	139	29.06.2022	25 of Arms Act and 302, 115, 120-B IPC	Salem Tabri, District Ludhiana
2	103	17.06.2018	379-B, 411 IPC	City Batala, District Gurdaspur
3	135	16.09.2022	307, 336, 148, 149 IPC and 25 of Arms Act	Sadar Batala, District Gurdaspur

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“5. That it is respectfully submitted that the present FIR No. 60 dated 06.04.2023 (Annexure P-1) was registered against the accused namely Amritpal Bal, Jaggu Bhagwanpuria, Gurmeet Randhawa @ Gurmeet Singh (present Petitioner), Jaskaranjeet Singh @ Sodhi and Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi on the basis of statement recorded by complainant namely Sandeep Suneja s/o Ved Parkash Suneja. The complainant stated in his statement that:-
(I) He is doing the work of property dealer and is colonizer and one of his projects is going on at village Pholriwal by the name of Sohana Residency

CRM-M-42109-2024

on 66 feet road.

(II) On 5.4.2023 at about 10:15 a.m., he was sitting at the house of his friend situated at Model Town, Jalandhar, and then a call was received from Whatsapp No. +16615281301 on his mobile phone No.9814273074 and these calls were received six times.

(III) The caller disclosed his name as Amritpal Bal and said that he knows each and every thing about the complainant and that his son has returned has return from Surrey Canada and told the complainant that his son is on their radar and if he wants to save him then he has to give protection money amounting to of Rs.50 lakhs.

(IV) The caller further told that earlier they had killed one cloth merchant of Nakodar namely Timmy from whom they had demanded protection money, but he had informed the police and thus, he was killed.

(V) The caller further stated that he can search about him on Google and he is an accomplice of Jaggu Bhagwanpuriya and in case he repeated the mistake like Timmy, then his son would be killed and in case he wanted, a video call could also be arranged from Jaggu Bhagwanpuriya. The complainant was instructed to quietly give the ransom money to the caller's person namely Gurmeet Randhawa in Batala. The complainant told the caller that he cannot arrange for Rs.50 lakhs as the amount is too much and the caller told him that the amount be given in installments. He told the caller to give to him some time. He blocked the number from which the call was received and then he received another call from a new number +15594658924 at 8:30 p.m. and the caller abused him and further told him as to how he has courage to block the number. After this, the deal was finalized that on 6.4.2023 two persons would come to Jalandhar at around at 3:00 p.m. to collect the first installment of Rs. 5 lakhs.

(VI) Today at 2:00 p.m. a call was received from Whatsapp No.+12095005931 on his mobile phone No.9814273074 and the caller told him that two persons namely Jaskaran and Gopi will come at 8:30 p.m. to PAP Chowk to take the ransom money and the caller asked him as to in which vehicle he would be coming in and the complainant disclosed the number of his Endeavor vehicle as 6501. The caller told him to bring the vehicle on Phagwara- Jalandhar road and park there. The complainant alongwith his friend Simranjit Singh son of Jagdish Singh, R/o House No.93/2 Adarsh Nagar, Jalandhar have come to Police Station to get the statement recorded.”

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which read as follows:

“A. Role of the Petitioner

Gurmeet Singh, the present petitioner was in contact with Amritpal Bal who had instructed him to collect the ransom money from the complainant but due to some work he couldn't go himself.

Gurmeet Singh thus instructed Jaskaranjit Singh to go and bring the

CRM-M-42109-2024

ransom money from Jalandhar from the complainant.

B. Evidence against the Petitioner

• Rs.5 lakhs that was given by the complainant to the accused Jaskanranjit Singh and Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi was recovered from them by the police at the time of their arrest. This money was told to be collected from the complainant by Gurmeet Singh, the present petitioner;

The statement of the complainant, the disclosure statement of co-accused Jaskaranjit Singh, that the petitioner was asked to collect the ransom money from complainant by the co-accused Amritpal Bal, the confessional statement of the petitioner and the arrest of the two accused on the spot goes to show that the petitioner was actively involved in connivance with other co-accused in collecting the ransom money from the complainant.”

7. A perusal of the bail petition and the documents attached prima facie points towards the petitioner's involvement and does not make out a case for bail. The impact of crime would not justify bail. Any further discussions will likely prejudice the petitioner; this court refrains from doing so.

8. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

9. **Petition dismissed.** All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

07.11.2024
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether reportable: No.