

2025:PHHC:051218



240 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

**CRM-M-33089-2024**  
**Date of Decision: 22.04.2025**

Jugraj Singh ...Petitioner

## Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

**Present:** Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)**

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting regular bail in case FIR No.05 dated 18.01.2024 under Sections 387/506 of IPC, 1860 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1954, registered at Police Station Cantonment, District Amritsar.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case has been registered on the statement of the complainant Sandeep Duggal. It was alleged that on 13.01.2024, Akashdeep Singh from his mobile had made a ransom call to the complainant asking him to pay Rs.5 lakhs. He was told that his friend Parminder Singh @ Phindi would call him and he should keep the money ready. Again on 16.01.2024 and 17.01.202, Parminder Singh @ Phindi called him on his mobile phone to pay the ransom of Rs.5 lakhs. He was threatened time and again for the money. Hence, it was prayed that case may be registered and legal action be taken against the accused persons. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced and during the investigation, the complicity of the petitioner was also

found and thus, he was also arrayed as co-accused and thereafter, he was arrested on 18.01.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 05.06.2024. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing the present second petition.

3. It has been contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely impleaded in the present case. He submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR, however, he has been arrayed as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused, which is not admissible evidence in the eyes of law. He submits that recovery as alleged to have been effected is totally a planted recovery by the Investigating Agency. He further submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. The complainant has also been examined by the prosecution and he has not supported the case of the prosecution. He further submits that the petitioner earlier approached this Court for grant of regular bail in CRM-M-15305-2024 which was dismissed vide order dated 24.04.2024. It is submitted that the petitioner has completed incarceration of more than one year. He, thus, submits that in view of the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the complicity of the petitioner was duly established and recovery of one activa, one country-made pistol, 3 bullets, 2 SIM cards and one passport was effected from the petitioner. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that in the present case the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused

on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. Though, during inquiry some recovery are shown to be effected from him. The complainant has been examined, however, he has not supported the case of the prosecution. The custody certificate would reflect that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year 02 months & 28 days as on 21.04.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Thus, keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**22.04.2025**  
*Parveen kumar*

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

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