



CRM-M-56803-2025

1

237

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

**CRM-M-56803-2025
Decided on : 01.12.2025**

Sonu alias Sonu Ram

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Ms. Priya Sahoo, Advocate and
Ms. Ashu Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG Haryana

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner-Sonu alias Sonu Ram has filed instant petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 89 dated 11.04.2025 registered under Sections 308(2), 308(4), 351 of BNS and Section 111(4) of BNS and Sections 25(1)B(a), 27(2) of Arms Act (added later on) at Police Station Civil Line, Kaithal Tehsil and District Kaithal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that as per allegations, in the impugned FIR No. 89 dated 11.04.2025, complainant-Pankaj Gupta had been receiving threatening calls demanding ransom of Rs. 50 lacs on his WhatsApp number. The complainant used to receive the calls from mobile No. 44750- 846-7088, in which caller demanded Rs. 50 lacs from the complainant and also told his name as Rohit Rana, one more name was taken by the caller i.e. of Tony Rana.

He further alleged that on 29.03.2025, one more call was received from Mobile

**CRM-M-56803-2025****2**

No. 44750 8467086 on the complainant's son Vansh Gupta's mobile No. 89508-94000.

He further argues that instant case was registered prior in time at Police Station Civil Line, District Kaithal, whereas same day the petitioner was involved in one more case i.e. FIR No. 222 dated 11.04.2025 registered under Section 25 of Arms Act and Section 109(1), 121(1), 132, 221 of BNS registered at Police Station Shahbad, District Kurukshetra. As per allegation in said case, the petitioner while in company of some other accused also fired at police team but in retaliation when police team fired shots, it hit at the petitioner. Accordingly, the petitioner had been arrested in the FIR No. 222 dated 11.04.2025 at first instance, and thereupon was also falsely planted as an accused in the present FIR No. 89 (supra). Further points out that both the FIRs are of different Districts and not of the same area. He further argues that nothing except of the said allegation is available with the prosecution against the petitioner because the mobile phone having contact with the complainant's mobile phone was even recovered from the deposition of co-accused- Vishal. Thus, petitioner being inside the jail for the last 06 months and 07 days, prays for grant of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel does not dispute the fact that the petitioner was firstly arrested in FIR No. 222 dated 11.04.2025 (supra) and thereupon he was implicated in the present FIR. He also clarified that in the instant case, nothing was recovered from the possession of the petitioner.

5. I have considered the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and gone through the petition and also the fact disclosed by learned State counsel that the petitioner is involved in two more cases. Undoubtedly, there remains no dispute that petitioner firstly was arrested in FIR No. 222 dated

**CRM-M-56803-2025****3**

11.04.2025, which was registered in District Kurukshetra and subsequently was implicated as accused in the present FIR No. 89 dated 11.04.2025 registered in District Kaithal and it would be heavily upon the prosecution to prove the charges of demanding ransom from the complaint-Pankaj Gupta or his son Vansh Gutpa. Without there being any substantial reasons, the petitioner can not be detained inside jail for an indefinite period. The petitioner has already been released on bail in FIR No. 222 dated 11.04.2025 by this Court vide order dated 26.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-28759-2025 (Annexure P-5).

6. Accordingly, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

December 01, 2025

reena

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO