

2025:PHHC:164163



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

263

CRM-M-63556-2025

Decided on:17.11.2025

Balkar Singh @ Kara**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****...Respondent****Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bhardwaj**

Present: Mr. Amit Dhawan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner during pendency of the trial in case FIR No.146 dated 27.08.2025, registered under Sections 308(5), 351(3), 61(2) of the BNS, 2023 (Sections 25(1B)(A) of the BNS, 2023 and Sections 54 and 59 of the Arms Act, 1959 added later on), at Police Station Sadar Nakodar, District Jalandhar (Rural).

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case has been registered on the statement of Gurpreet Singh, in which it was alleged that he had returned from England about two months ago to meet his family. His younger daughter Rajvir Kaur was allured on 09.06.2025 by the boy of his village, namely, Prince and his wife Karamjit Kaur lodged the FIR No.100 dated 15.06.2025, under Sections 137(2), 96, 61(2) of the BNS, 2023 at Police Station Sadar Nakodar in that regard. However, his daughter returned on 21.06.2025 and, thereafter, after getting her medically examined, the offence under Section 64(2) of the BNS, 2023 and 6 of the POCSO Act, 2012 were added in the said FIR. The boy Prince again took away her daughter on 29.06.2025 and till date, there was no information about their whereabouts.

Thereafter, the complainant started receiving extortion calls wherein he was threatened to pay an amount of Rs.3 lacs. On enquiry, it was found that

2025:PHHC:164163



Sukhdeep Singh, Prabhdeep Singh @ Pawa, Balkar Singh @ Kara (petitioner herein) and Daljit Singh were involved in making extortion calls to him and as a threat to his life was apprehended, thus, the request was made to take action. On statement of the complainant, the FIR was lodged and the investigation commenced. During investigation, the complicity of the petitioner surfaced and, thus, he was arrayed as an accused vide DDR No.37 dated 27.08.2025 and he was arrested on the same day. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar praying for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned trial Court declined the same vide order dated 14.10.2025. Hence, aggrieved by the said order, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present FIR on the basis of assumptions and presumptions. It is submitted that the FIR has been registered after a delay of 27 days from the date when the complainant had allegedly transferred an amount of Rs.10,000/- in the account of the co-accused Sukhdeep Singh. It is submitted that the petitioner has no relation with the co-accused and he had not committed any overt act. It is further submitted that the petitioner has no role to play in FIR No.100 dated 15.06.2025, which was lodged by the wife of the complainant, wherein his daughter was allegedly allured by one Prince. He further submitted that the investigating agencies have concocted a false story of the recovery of one toy pistol from the petitioner. He, thus, submitted that there is no evidence against the petitioner for proving his complicity in the alleged commission of offence and, thus, he deserves to be granted regular bail by this Court.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On asking of the Court, Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and submitted that FIR No.100 dated 15.06.2025 has already been lodged against co-accused Prince, wherein

2025:PHHC:164163



daughter of the complainant was allured and the offence under the POCSO Act, 2012 were also added. It is submitted that the petitioner along with co-accused is involved in making extortion calls to the complainant and a toy pistol has also been recovered from the petitioner during investigation. He further submitted that the case is at initial stage and, thus, no case for grant of bail is made out and the present petition deserves dismissal.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the available record, it is deciphered that FIR No.100 dated 15.06.2025 is already pending against the co-accused, wherein daughter of the complainant has been allured by the co-accused Prince. Thereafter, extortion calls have been made to the complainant and he was threatened to pay an amount of Rs.3 lacs. The complainant had transferred an amount of Rs.10,000/- in the account of co-accused Sukhdeep Singh and complicity of the petitioner has been surfaced during investigation and a toy pistol has also been recovered from the petitioner. The case is at the initial stage, the investigation is at threshold and the petitioner has suffered the incarceration of only 02 months and 14 days.

7. Keeping in view overall attending circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not qualify for the grant of bail at this stage and hence, the present petition, being denuded of any merit, is hereby dismissed.

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

November 17, 2025
vinod*

(Rajesh Bhardwaj)
Judge

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