



CRM-M-39713-2025

-1-

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

228

CRM-M-39713-2025

Date of decision: 26th September, 2025

Dinesh Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Akram Hussain, 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. 111 dated 09.05.2025 registered under Sections 308(2), 351(2) and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Balongi, District SAS Nagar, Mohali.

2. As per the allegations on the night of 02.04.2025, the complainant-Shiva was standing near Gopal Sweets, Kharar and was waiting for an auto when two bike riders reached there and offered lift to him. Believing them, he boarded the motor bike. They took him under the ATS Building bridge and after reaching there, caught hold of him. In the meanwhile, one more person reached there. All three of them opened an assault upon him and gave him fist blows and slaps. Another showed iron



datar to him. Under coercion, they got transferred an amount of Rs. 17,800/- through Google Pay in the account of one of their accomplice whose name appeared on Google Pay as Ankush. They, then, managed to flee. The complainant made inquiries and came to know that in a similar manner three youths had robbed one Shubham Jaggi on the same night. He also came to know that the names of those three youths were Dinesh Singh(petitioner), Randhir Singh and Ankush. On his complaint, FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner and the co-accused Randhir Singh were arrested on 09.05.2025. They were identified by the complainant as well as victim Shubham Jaggi, as the same persons, who had extended threats to them and had coerced them to transfer money through Google pay. The petitioner suffered a disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and that the amount of money got extracted from the complainant was distributed amongst themselves. The accused Randhir Singh also suffered disclosure statement. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 09.05.2025. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. He is not beneficiary of any transaction and the amount in question had been transferred to the bank account of the co-accused Ankush. He has clean antecedents. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against



the petitioner, he does not deserve to be released on bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have extorted money from the complainant by wrongfully restraining him and by extending threats to him. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. He is in custody since 09.05.2025. Trial will take time to conclude. Keeping in view the period spent by the petitioner in custody, his clean antecedents coupled with the fact that no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore and further that the bail is the rule and jail is an exception, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the same 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, 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 allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

26th September, 2025

Parveen Sharma

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