

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:116065



CRM-M-29162-2025 (O&M)

Reserved on:21.08.2025

Date of decision:29.08.2025

Balraj Singh @ Vishal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Gobind Singh Randhawa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

...

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.257 dated 08.11.2024, registered under Sections 308(7), 111 of the BNS and Section 25(6) and (7) of the Arms Act, at Police Station City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.

2. As per the allegations, on 08.11.2024, on receipt of an information to the effect that the accused Karanbir Singh, Yadwinder Singh @ Akash, Jarmandeep Singh @ Armaan, Harmandeep Singh, Tejbir Singh, Yodhbir Singh @ Yodha and Harpreet Singh @ Happy Baba had formed a gang and used to deal with illicit weapons and were also involved in extorting money by intimidating public persons as well as in committing robberies and could be apprehended, FIR was registered. Investigation

proceedings were initiated. Accused Yadwinder Singh @ Akash, Jarmandeep @ Armaan and Tejbir Singh were arrested on 08.11.2024. They suffered disclosure statements and got recovered firearms and cartridges. They also disclosed that they used to ask for ransom as per the directions of co-accused Harpreet Singh @ Happy Baba and Karandeep Singh and had opened fire on the shops and houses of those persons, who did not give ransom money to them. They further disclosed that the present petitioner and accused Azad Singh @ Arshdeep were also involved with them and all of them used to ask for ransom money. On the basis of their statements, the petitioner was nominated as an accused. Co-accused Harpreet Singh @ Happy Baba was arrested. Another accused Bikram Masih was also arrested subsequently and he suffered disclosure statement to the effect that on 04.11.2024, the petitioner along with co-accused had made call to one Waheguru Singh and demanded a sum of Rs.50 lakhs as ransom money and otherwise he was threatened to be killed. The petitioner was arrested. Investigation qua him now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He was not named in the FIR. There is no direct or indirect incriminating evidence to connect him with the crime. He is only a labourer. He is in custody since 13.11.2024. His involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of bail to him. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner and his antecedents, he does not deserve to be released on bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to be a member of a gang, which was involved in demand of ransom money from the public persons by criminally intimidating them and threatening them at gun point and by use of illicit weapons and is further alleged to have opened fire at shops of such persons, who refused to give ransom money. No specific instance involving the petitioner in such like offence, is however, been quoted either in the FIR or in the status report as filed by the respondent/State. No specific overt act has been attributed to him. He is in custody since 13.11.2024. He is involved in some more cases but cannot be denied benefit of bail due to that reason. Keeping in view the nature of allegations, which have been levelled against the petitioner, the period of his incarceration, and the attendant facts but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves to be extended the benefit of bail of bail. Accordingly the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is clarified that 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 allowed, pending application if any is rendered infructuous.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

29.08.2025

harjeet

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