



CRM-M-56858-2024 and  
CRM-M-60630-2024

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

Reserved on: 26<sup>th</sup> May, 2025

Pronounced on: 29<sup>th</sup> May, 2025

1. CRM-M-56858-2024

Sanjeev Kumar Chhikara

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

2. CRM-M-60630-2024

Nirmal Chhikara

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Deepender Singh, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. J.S. Toor, Advocate and  
Mr. Adhiraj Toor, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J :-**

This common order shall dispose of these two petitions which have been arisen out of the same FIR bearing No. 98 dated 12.10.2024 registered under Sections 66-E and 67 of Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008, Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 and Sections 377, 384, 386, 389, 420 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Kiratpur Sahib, Rupnagar.

2. The petition bearing CRM-M-56858-2024 has been filed by the petitioner-Sanjeev Kumar Chhikara (**hereinafter referred as petitioner**



**No.1)** seeking benefit of regular bail, whereas, the petition bearing CRM-M-60630-2024 has been filed by the petitioner-Nirmal Chhikara (**hereinafter referred as petitioner No.2)** seeking pre-arrest bail.

3. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of these petitions are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint lodged by the complainant-Uttam Parshad Yadav, alleging therein that in the year 2022, he was undergoing a pilot training from Aviation Training School, Kanpur and was making preparation for DGCA examination, when he came into contact with petitioner No.1 through social media and started communication with petitioner No.1 with intention to seek guidance for his studies. The petitioner No.1 was running a coaching institute at that time. He induced the complainant to stay in Delhi for sometime. He was compelled by petitioner No.1 to stay at different places in different hotels and a mess in Delhi cantonment. He also asked for financial support from the complainant on the pretext that he was having problems in running his coaching institute. The complainant while considering the petitioner as father figure had regards for him. During his stay at Delhi, petitioner No.1 shared the same room as that of the complainant on one particular night and showed his nude pictures and videos from his mobile phone to the complainant. When the complainant raised objection, he felt apologetic. He asked the complainant to accompany him to some hill station and took him to Manali, wherein also he committed the same act of showing his objectionable pictures and videos, thereby making the complainant uncomfortable.

4. The complainant further alleged that on 14.06.2023, the petitioner No.1 brought the complainant back to Delhi in his own car and



while on the way, he committed act of carnal intercourse against the order of nature with him in his vehicle after extending threat to kill the complainant. The complainant was very much scared and had fallen sick. The petitioner No.1 thereafter started blackmailing the complainant and committed act of sodomy with him in the month of June, 2023. He was also physically assaulted by petitioner No.1. The same acts continued for a number of times. The petitioner No.1 made explicit videos of the complainant and started extorting money from him by extending threats to make the same viral on social media, if money was not given to him. In this manner, he extracted an amount of Rs. 80,00,000/- from the complainant in cash and also through bank transactions.

5. The complainant further alleged that the petitioner No.1 had also secured his signatures on certain papers. He demanded more and more money from the complainant and threats were extended to him to make his vulnerable pictures and videos viral. The complainant had also requested petitioner No.2, who is wife of petitioner No.1 for returning of the money as taken by petitioner No.1 but to no avail. Rather, he was threatened by petitioner No.2 also who along with her brother, was a part of conspiracy with petitioner No.1 for extorting money from the complainant.

6. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner No.1 was arrested on 12.10.2024. The victim as well as petitioner No.1 were medically examined. The statement of the complainant/victim was recorded under Section 183 of BNSS wherein he reiterated the allegations against the petitioners. Investigation qua petitioner No.1 stands concluded. Apprehending her arrest, petitioner No.2 had moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail. Vide order dated 16.11.2024, she



was directed to join the investigation by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rupnagar, however, her prayer for grant of pre-arrest bail was dismissed vide order dated 27.11.2024.

7. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner No.1 that he has been falsely implicated in this case. After his retirement in the year 2018, he was imparting education to Army aspirants through his coaching institute. He was trapped by the complainant in sextortion and an amount of rupees more than three lakhs had been extracted from him by the complainant who projected himself as a woman namely 'Anjail Birla' on social media and procured the nude photographs of the complainant and then started blackmailing him. There is inordinate delay in lodging of the FIR. The prosecution version is highly improbable and unnatural. The petitioner himself is a victim. He is ready to abide by the terms and conditions to be imposed by this Court. He has clean antecedents. As such, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

8. On behalf of petitioner No.2, it is argued by learned counsel that she has joined investigation in pursuance of the order dated 04.12.2024 and orders passed by this Court subsequently. It is submitted that her custodial interrogation is not required. Neither any recovery is to be effected from her. The ingredients for commission of subject offences have not been attracted as against her at all. It is, therefore, urged that the order for grant of interim bail as passed in her favour deserves to be made absolute.

9. A common reply/status report has been filed by respondent-State. It is argued by learned DAG, Punjab assisted by learned counsel for the complainant that there are serious allegations against the petitioner No.1. He not only induced the complainant to part with a huge amount of money



but also committed the acts of sodomy with him and also extorted money from him. Not even this, he was in conscious possession of weapons, the licence of which were forged and had not been renewed. One of such weapons has not been got recovered. A case bearing FIR No. 50 dated 05.03.2025 registered under Sections 329(3)(4) read with Sections 61(2) of BNS and Section 52-A of Prisons Act has been recently registered against him. He is a man of criminal background. The complainant is yet to be examined. There are chances of his intimidating the complainant or absconding, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition do not deserve to be allowed.

10. With regard to petitioner No.2, it is argued that her complicity in the commission of offence of extorting money from the complainant by hatching a conspiracy with him also stands established on the basis of allegations as levelled in the FIR. Though she has joined investigation but has not co-operated with the same, as one weapon which was admittedly in custody of the petitioner No.1 and which as per his own disclosure, had been handed over to petitioner No.2 has not been got recovered to her. It has also been proved that the licences on those two weapons kept in conscious possession of the petitioners were not renewed by the competent authority and fake endorsement qua renewal of the same had been made. Her custodial interrogation is must for recovery of the weapon as well as for conducting thorough investigation in the matter. Therefore, it is urged that, petitioner No.2 too does not deserve to be given concession of bail.

11. Rival contentions raised by the parties have been considered.

12. The allegations against the petitioner No.2 are that she hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused and in pursuance thereof, the petitioner



No.1 had been extorting money from the complainant. Her custodial interrogation is sought on the ground that entries regarding renewal of armed weapon were forged by her and petitioner No.1. The petitioner No.2 joined investigation as per the orders of the concerned Additional Sessions Judge, at the time when she had moved application for pre-arrest bail as well as in pursuance of order dated 04.12.2024. The documents required from her have also been produced. She has asserted that she does not possess any other weapon. So far as the non recovery of weapon is concerned, the same cannot by itself be a ground for denial of bail. The alleged forged documents as to renewal of licensed weapon are already in custody of police and for that purpose, she is not required to be interrogated. It is a question of debate, as to whether, she had a hand in commission of the offenses of extortion of money, cheating, etc. as alleged to be committed by petitioner No. 1. It is only on the basis of thorough assessment of the evidence to be produced during trial, that such questions can be evaluated. Given the nature of the allegations as leveled against petitioner No. 2, this Court is of the considered opinion that her pre-trial incarceration is not required.

13. In view of the above-discussed facts, the petition filed by petitioner No. 2 is allowed, and the order dated 04.12.2024 granting interim bail is ordered to be made absolute, subject to her complying with usual terms and conditions as provided under Section 482 of BNSS.

14. So far as, petitioner No. 2 is concerned, counter allegations have been leveled by the complainant as well as himself against each other. The complainant has alleged acts of committing sodomy by the petitioner No. 1 with him, whereas, the former has alleged that the complainant had entrapped him by projecting himself as a female with the name of 'Anjali



Birla' through social media. He had procured objectionable photographs of Petitioner No. 1. He had sent his photographs in a female version and then had started sextortion, thereby extracting a sum of rupees more than 3 lakhs from the Petitioner No. 1. Both the parties have leveled allegations against each other. However, the allegations as leveled against petitioner No. 1 are quite serious in nature. He has been involved in another case during the pendency of this petition itself and does not have clean antecedents. The complainant is yet to be examined. The apprehension expressed by him that the petitioner No. 1 may intimidate him cannot be stated to be unfounded at this stage. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as leveled against the petitioner, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment upon the merits of the case, lest they prejudice the trial, in the considered opinion of this Court, the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail at this stage. Accordingly, the petition filed by Petitioner No. 1 is dismissed.

15. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

16. Since the main petitions have been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

17. Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

**[MANISHA BATRA]**  
**JUDGE**

**29<sup>th</sup> May, 2025**

*Parveen Sharma*

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*  
: *Yes / No*