



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

102

CRM-M-21548-2025**Date of decision: May 08, 2025****GURPREET SINGH @ GOPI**

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Hitesh Chopra, Advocate and
Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The instant petition is the second petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.14 dated 14.02.2025 under Section 7 and 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, Sections 308(2), 111, 61(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Sadar Batala, District Gurdaspur (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is not named in the FIR (Annexure P-1) and has been implicated solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of a co-accused Ankush Saini. It is further submitted that the genesis of the case lies in secret information received by the police that ASI Surjit Singh had amassed disproportionate assets, which led to a raid at his residence, resulting in the recovery of Rs.76,32,000/- in cash and a Fortuner.



3. Pursuant to the arrest of co-accused Ankush Saini, his disclosure allegedly implicated the petitioner as a co-conspirator in an extortion racket. Allegedly, the petitioner, along with the co-accused, was engaged in extortion and extorted Rs.50 lakhs from one Jagdish, which they allegedly shared. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, claims that he has been falsely implicated, and that his role, at best, was limited to facilitating a payment on the express request of Jagdish himself. It has been argued that the statement of the complainant was recorded under coercion, and the petitioner, being an active member of a political party opposed to the ruling Government, has been targeted for extraneous reasons.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. H.S. Deol, Sr. DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. He, on instructions, has submitted that the petitioner is involved in similar criminal cases of extortion as well under the NDPS Act. It has also been submitted by the learned State counsel that enough incriminating evidence had been collected by the police subsequent to the registration of the FIR in question, which clearly revealed that all the accused including the petitioner were part of an extortion gang and had been extorting huge sums of money from different people.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the relevant material placed on record.



8. The case at hand arises from a raid conducted at the residence of co-accused ASI Surjit Singh on the basis of credible intelligence indicating possession of unaccounted wealth acquired through corrupt practices. The raid yielded substantial cash recovery to the tune of Rs.76,32,000/-, along with a high-value vehicle. Subsequent investigation led to the apprehension of co-accused Ankush Saini, from whom Rs.5,91,500/- in cash, a pistol and a vehicle were recovered. His disclosure statement led to the involvement of the petitioner in repeated acts of extortion. It is specifically alleged that the petitioner, along with the co-accused, had jointly received Rs.50 lakhs in extorted money from the complainant-Jagdish, which they divided amongst themselves. The allegations further suggest that the petitioner was habitually involved in such extortion activities and that this was not an isolated instance. As per the learned State counsel, the petitioner is involved in 3 other criminal cases including cases of identical nature.

9. The nature and gravity of the allegations, which involve organized criminal activity including extortion, intimidation, and the use of firearms reflect a serious threat to public order and safety.

10. At this stage, the investigation is at a nascent stage. The possibility of the police gathering further incriminating evidence cannot be ruled out. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner would, therefore, be necessitated for unearthing the wider nexus of organized crime involved.



11. In view of the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

12. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

13. 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.

May 08, 2025
Jaspreet Kaur

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*