



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

214

CRM-M-9680-2025

Date of decision: 5th August, 2025

Satnam Singh Dhawan

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. GPS Ghuman, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. TPS Walia, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 11 dated 30.11.2024 registered under Sections 384, 420, 465, 467, 468 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Economic Offences Wing Punjab, Vigilance Bureau, Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

2. As per the allegations, a complaint received at Vigilance Bureau, Economic Wing Ludhiana had been enquired into, and it was revealed that the petitioner in connivance with the co-accused Bhupinder Punj and some other persons used to blackmail the police officials posted in the office of Regional Transport Authority (RTA) Ludhiana by extending threats to lodge complaints against them with the Vigilance Department and also used to coerce such officials to carry out the tasks as desired by them by extorting money from the public persons and also from the officials/officers



of RTA. On enquiry, officials of RTA also produced several screenshots and *WhatsApp* messages verifying that threats were being extended to them by the petitioner and co-accused. One data entry operator of the office of RTA even disclosed that he was compelled to transfer an amount of Rs 80,000/- into two different accounts by the petitioner and that the accused Bhupinder Punj had come to him and demanded a sum of Rs 30,000/- on asking of the petitioner and that Bhupinder Punj was an active conduit in the extortion racket, who used to collect money for the present petitioner. The petitioner was nominated as an accused. Apprehending his arrest, he filed an application for grant of anticipatory bail which was dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana vide Order dated 16.12.2024.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, he is engaged in the business of sale/purchase of cars. He had met Dinesh Bansal, who had introduced himself as a transport advisor and had subsequently borrowed a sum of Rs. 2,00,000/- from him. He returned only an amount of Rs. 60,000/- even after repeated requests. The petitioner subsequently came to know that the aforesaid Dinesh Bansal was indulging in embezzlement of government revenue in connivance with the public officers/officials of RTA and had amassed several properties through *Benami* transactions. He had moved a complaint against them. The FIR in this case was a counter-blast to the same. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. It is, therefore, argued that



he deserves to be extended benefit of pre-arrest bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that there are serious allegations against the petitioner, who, in connivance with the co-accused had been blackmailing the officials/officers of RTA and had been trying to extort money from them. The petition for seeking grant of bail by co-accused Bhupinder Punj has been dismissed by this Court as well as by Hon'ble Supreme Court. The bail petition of co-accused Rajiv Kumar Sood has also been dismissed. The petitioner also does not deserve to be extended benefit of pre-arrest bail. His custodial interrogation is required for the purpose of conducting a proper and deeper probe into the matter. Even otherwise, no case for grant of pre-arrest bail is made out. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. Rival contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties have been considered.

6. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The bail petitions filed by the co-accused against whom similar allegations have been levelled, have been dismissed. No sparing or exceptional circumstance for grant of pre-arrest bail is made out in favour of the petitioner. It is also well settled that the Court must be circumspect while exercising powers for grant of anticipatory bail and it should not be granted as a matter of rule but has to be granted only when the Court is convinced that exceptional circumstances exist to resort to that extraordinary remedy. No such circumstance, however appears to be existing. Keeping in view the gravity



of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner and the afore-discussed facts, this court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

5th August, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*