



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

217

CRM-M-44653-2024
Date of decision: October 1st, 2024

Mandeep Singh
.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Prashant Vashisth, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) in case FIR No.53 dated 11.06.2024 under Sections 365/120-B of the IPC read with Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, registered at Police Station Koom Kalan, Ludhiana Police Commissionerate.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, along with other co-accused, for allegedly extorting money from the complainant by threatening to implicate him in false drug-related cases. While drawing the attention to the FIR, annexed as Annexure P-1, learned counsel submits that a bare perusal of the same clearly indicates that the entire act was committed by co-accused Satnam Singh @ Happy and Jagdish Singh, with the petitioner being dragged into the case merely as an accomplice. Learned counsel further argues that the

**CRM-M-44653-2024****-2-**

custodial interrogation of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose, as no recovery is to be made from him.

3. In compliance with the order dated 09.09.2024, an affidavit of Assistant Commissioner of Police, Industrial Area-A, Ludhiana, on behalf of the respondent-State has been filed, which is taken on record subject to just exceptions.

4. *Per contra*, learned State Counsel, while opposing the petitioner's prayer and submissions, has drawn the attention of this Court to the allegations levelled in the FIR, annexed as Annexure P-1 as well as the affidavit filed in the Court today. He further submits, on instructions, that the petitioner is facing serious allegations of being part of an extortion gang along with his co-accused. The gang, according to the learned State counsel, has been involved in duping innocent persons by threatening them with false criminal cases. It is further submitted that during the investigation, co-accused Satnam Singh made a disclosure statement, revealing that he, along with petitioner-Mandeep Singh, with whom he shared a five-year acquaintance and a history of drug consumption, had conspired to commit robbery due to their lack of funds to procure drugs. Satnam Singh confessed that on the relevant day, after failing to locate a suitable victim, they spotted a young boy. Thereafter, co-accused Jagdeep Singh, a Punjab Police official, in his uniform, forcibly placed the boy into their car, falsely identifying themselves as officers from the CIA Staff, Doraha. The boy was then threatened with being falsely implicated in a case under the NDPS Act.

In fear, the boy and his family were intimidated through phone calls,



CRM-M-44653-2024

-3-

and a demand of Rs. 30,000/- was made for his release. Under duress, the family arrived at 01:00 AM with the money, after which the boy was released. The accused then divided the extorted sum of Rs.30,000/- among themselves.

5. The learned State Counsel has also apprised this Court that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is crucial to uncover the full *modus operandi* of the crime, as well as to recover the extorted amount.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

7. There are, *prima facie*, serious allegations against the petitioner, who, along with his co-accused, allegedly coerced the complainant into paying illegal gratification in exchange for his release after posing as officers from the CIA Staff, Doraha. This Court concurs with the contentions of the learned State Counsel that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is indeed necessary to uncover the complete *modus operandi*.

8. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, petitioner does not deserve the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

9. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

October 1st, 2024

Puneet

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No