



CRM-M-13771-2025

-1-

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

211

CRM-M-13771-2025

Date of decision: 7th April, 2025

Rajiv Kumar Sood

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Manoj Tanwar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, 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 was filed at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, Economic Offences Wing Ludhiana, which was inquired into and it was found that the accused Bhupinder Punj and Satnam Dhawan in connivance with some other persons, used to blackmail the officials posted in the Regional Transport Authority (RTO) by extending threats to file complaints against them with the Vigilance Department and used to coerce such officials to carry out the tasks desired by them, by extorting



money from the public persons and also from the officials/officers of RTA. The officials of RTA office also produced several screenshots and *whatsApp* messages verifying the factum about their being threatened by the accused Satnam Dhawan and Bhupinder Punj. One Dinesh Bansal, data entry operator disclosed that he was compelled to transfer an amount of Rs. 80,000/- by accused Satnam Dhawan in two different accounts. He further disclosed that the petitioner on being sent by accused Satnam Dhawan had gone to collect a sum of Rs. 30,000/- from Dinesh Bansal. It was also revealed that the petitioner was an active conduit in the extortion racket and used to collect money for Satnam Dhawan. He was nominated as such. Apprehending his arrest, he moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, which was dismissed vide order dated 23.12.2024.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is a specially abled person suffering from 65% disability. He never worked as an agent of the accused Satnam Dhawan or any other person. No money has been received by him from Dinesh Bansal. Infact, he has been implicated by Ravindra Kataria, who is a transport service provider in the premises of transport authority and is a tout for Amardeep Singh, Clerk. The said Ravinder Kataria is in the habit of filing complaints against the officials of RTA. He has enmity with accused Bhupinder Punj and Satnam and only to make his case strong against the above named persons, he has implicated the petitioner. No recovery is to be effected from him. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. With these broad submissions, it is urged that



the petitioner deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, there are serious allegations against the petitioner, who in connivance with the co-accused, had been blackmailing the officials of RTA. The investigation that has been conducted so far has revealed that the petitioner used to receive documents for issuance of registration certificates, permits etc. from the public and by paying bribe used to get the work done from the officials of RTA. Ludhiana. His custodial interrogation is required for eliciting the truth. No extra ordinary and exceptional circumstance for grant of anticipatory bail has been made out. Accordingly, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. Rival contentions raised by both sides have been considered.

6. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused is alleged to have extorted money from the officials of RTA by blackmailing them on the pretext of filing complaints with Vigilance Department, against them. As per the further allegations, he had also been conniving with the co-accused and some officials of office of RTA to get the tasks in the said office done, by illegal means. For the purpose of conducting proper investigation in the matter, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. It is also well settled that the Court must be circumspect while exercising such power for grant of anticipatory bail and it should not be granted as a matter of rule and has to be granted only when the Court is convinced that exceptional circumstances exist to resort to that extra ordinary remedy. In the present case, no such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, 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

7th April, 2025
Parveen Sharma

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