

**CRM-M-65184-2025****242 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-65184-2025****Date of Decision: 26.11.2025**

Daljit Singh @ Manna

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

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

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

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. On 09.06.2025, his younger daughter Rajvir Kaur was allured by a boy of his village, namely, Prince, his mother Charanjit Kaur and sister Parwinder Kaur with motive to solemnize marriage. One Gurbal Singh @ Ludhar was also accompanying them. On the basis of statement of his wife Karamjit Kaur, an FIR No.100 dated 15.06.2025, under Sections 137(2), 96, 61(2) of the BNS, 2023 was registered at Police Station Sadar Nakodar in that regard. After the registration of the FIR, his daughter returned on 21.06.2025 and, thereafter, after getting her medically examined, the



CRM-M-65184-2025

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 is 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 Sukhdeep Singh @ Shera, Prabhdeep Singh @ Pawa, Balkar Singh @ Kara and Daljit Singh @ Manna (petitioner herein) were involved in making extortion calls to him and 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 case of the petitioner is distinguishable from that of co-accused, namely, Balkar Singh @ Kara, whose bail petition bearing CRM-M-63556-2025 has been dismissed by this Court vide order dated 17.11.2025. 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

**CRM-M-65184-2025**

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 boy, namely, Prince. He further submitted that the Investigating Agency has 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.Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and submitted that FIR No.100 dated 15.06.2025 has been lodged against co-accused Prince, wherein daughter of the complainant was allured and the offence under the POCSO Act, 2012 was 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 has submitted that case of the petitioner is not distinguishable from that of the co-accused, namely, Balkar Singh @ Kara, whose bail petition has already been dismissed by this Court. He further submitted that the case is on initial stage and, thus, no case for grant of bail is made out and the present petition deserves dismissal. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the



CRM-M-65184-2025

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 as per custody certificate, the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of only 02 months and 23 days as on 25.11.2025. Custody certificate further shows that the petitioner is involved in other cases, out of which, in one case he was prosecuted for the offence under Section 302 IPC, however, he was convicted for the offence under Section 304 Part II IPC for seven years of rigorous imprisonment in the same. However, he is on bail in that case.

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.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

26.11.2025

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned
Whether Reportable

: Yes/No
: Yes/No