



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.25490 of 2025 (O&M)

Reserved on: 01.12.2025

Date of Decision: 15.12.2025

Vikas Ram @ Vicky

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Pranjal Chaudhary, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 307, 387, 120-B of IPC, and Section 25-54-59 of Arms Act, the FIR No.58 dated 01.04.2024, has been lodged in Police Station City Moga, District Moga. The petitioner has been arrested in the above mentioned case as an accused. Since the petitioner is in custody, he has filed the present petition for the benefit of bail. This is second petition for bail, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Surakhsa Sanhita, 2023.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Gurjeet Singh' son of 'Darshan Singh'. It was stated by the above named complainant that in the name of 'Boparai Immigration' he was having an office on Amritsar Road, Gill Gas Agency Building, Moga. As per complainant, on 01.04.2024, when



he was present in his office near reception a young boy with muffled face, wearing a yellow colour 'parna', and carrying a pistol in his hand, came there and fired gun-shot upon him with an intention to kill. As per complainant, the above named assailant after firing a gun-shot upon him, run away from the spot. It was further stated by the complainant, the above mentioned gun-shot hit the sofa.

3. It was further stated by the complainant that thereafter, he received a call from mobile number +1(204)889-8408 and the caller identified himself as 'Gopi'. As per complainant, the caller had asked the complainant that on that day he was saved but if he would not pay R.50,00,000/- as ransom he (complainant) would be killed. According to complainant, his brother 'Kuldeep' had chased the assailant and found that he had come on motorcycle being driven by another person wearing a yellow colour 'parna', and that motorcycle was not having a registration number plate.

4. It was also stated by the complainant that someone known as 'Gopi' had committed the above mentioned incident at the instance of 'Navtej Singh' @ 'Bhola' son of 'Harjivan Singh' and 'Harjivan Singh' son of 'Gurdev Singh', who had passed the information to the group of assailants and that they wanted to extract money from the complainant.

5. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of above mentioned information the formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation



taken-up.

6. Heard.

7. It has been contended on behalf of learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent having no nexus, whatsoever, with the commission of crime and that with a motive to implicate the petitioner in false case a false story has been cooked up by the complainant. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, initially, the accused, who was named in the FIR, i.e. 'Harjivan Singh' was arrested and 2 days police remand of the above named person was accorded by the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate but after interrogation for two days it was found that 'Harjivan' was innocent, and thereafter. supplementary statement of complainant was recorded, pursuant to which, petitioner has been arrested.

8. The learned counsel for the petitioner has further contended that the falsity of the story set-up by the prosecution (and the complainant) can be gazed from the fact that initially 'Harjivan' was implicated as accused in the present case, and when despite police remand nothing can be extracted from him, the complainant suffered another statement and named the petitioner as one of the assailant. As per learned counsel for the petitioner a fake story has been developed by the prosecution with the assistance of complainant, wherein it has been depicted that the complainant at this own level had made inquiry and found that attack upon him was launched by the petitioner.



9. In addition to above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has also argued that from the date of dismissal of former bail petition on 17.12.2024, there is no significant progress in the trial and that out of 16 not even a single prosecution witness has been examined till today. The learned counsel for the petitioner has also contended that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of 1 year and more than 7 months, and that trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, and that detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose, and therefore, the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.

10. Per contra, the learned State counsel has contended that allegations against the petitioner are with regard to involvement in threatening and terrorizing of a businessman for the purpose of extracting ransom. As per learned counsel State counsel, the kind of allegations which have been levelled against the petitioner are, too, grievous to take a lenient view for the petitioner, and accord him benefit of bail.

11. The learned State counsel has further argued that the offence of seeking ransom has a very far reaching negative impact on the law and order situation of the society and also the economic development of the country. As per learned State counsel, if the businessmen are not allowed to do their business in a free and fearless atmosphere their business cannot thrive which will have a negative impact upon the financial and tax management of the Government.



12. According to learned State counsel, in view of the fact that just after the incident the ransom call was received, and that, too, from a foreign country the big nexus involved behind the commission of crime stands exposed, and that the person like the petitioner, if released on bail will indulge in similar kind of activity which will have a very negative impact on the society. While assuring that every efforts will be made to conclude the trial at fast pace, the learned State counsel has sought for dismissal of present petition for bail.

13. The record has been perused carefully.

14. In the present case at the very outset, it is pertinent to mention here that there are very specific and categorical allegations that in a broad day light when the complainant was present in his own office surrounded by his own employees, real brother and a friend, a dare devil act was committed by the petitioner who fired gun-shot upon the petitioner. The firing of gun-shot is a fact which can not be easily denied in the present case and the receipt of ransom call just after the incident further magnifies the negative impact of a crime committed against the complainant. Since there are very specific and categorical allegations against the petitioner that he was responsible for firing of gun-shot upon the complainant, in my opinion, in the given fact-situation, this argument of learned State counsel cannot be ignored that the crime such as seeking ransom from businessman in the market, has a very negative impact not only on the psychology of the



society regarding the security and safety, but also on the economic progress of the State and society as well.

15. Otherwise also, this is the second petition for bail moved by the petitioner and from the date of dismissal of former bail petition no significant change in circumstance has taken place. As far as the allegations with regard to delay in trial is concerned in my opinion the above mentioned issue can be addressed by issuing a direction to the learned trial Court to expedite and fast track the trial.

16. As a sequel to above mentioned observations, it is hereby held that the present petition is devoid of merit and deserves dismissal. Hence, the same is hereby **dismissed** accordingly. However, the learned trial Court is requested to make all out efforts to conclude the trial within a period of 6 months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

15.12.2025
Manoj Bhutani

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No