



CRM-M-2702-2025 & 1
CRM-M-55865-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
232 (2 cases)
Decided on: January 22, 2026

1. CRM-M-2702-2025:

Gurwinder Singh @ Grinder Singh @ Ginder Singh
.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab
.....Respondent
2. CRM-M-55865-2025:

Manpreet Singh @ Preet
.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. L.M. Gulati, Advocate (in CRM-M-2702-2025)

Mr. Sehajpreet Singh Sandhu, Advocate, and
Ms. Dilpreet Kaur, Advocate (in CRM-M-55865-2025)
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. H.S. Rakhra, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1.

This common order would decide the fate of two petitions, i.e. CRM-M-2702-2025, filed by petitioner – Gurwinder Singh @ Grinder Singh @ Ginder Singh; and CRM-M-55865-2025, filed by petitioner Manpreet Singh @ Preet, which have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case FIR No. 229, dated 03.09.2024, under Sections 62, 351, 308(5) of BNS, 2023, and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 (offences under Section 317(2), 309(4) and 61(2) of BNS, 2023 added later on; and



**CRM-M-2702-2025 &
CRM-M-55865-2025**

2

Section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, stands deleted later on), registered at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar Rural.

Before proceeding further, it would be necessary to notice that petitioner - Manpreet Singh @ Preet has filed second petition for grant of regular bail in the said FIR, because the first petition i.e. CRM-M-6802-2025, filed by him, was ordered to be dismissed having been withdrawn, vide order dated 15.05.2025, passed by the then Co-ordinate Bench of this Court

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) argues that as per the allegations of the complainant Sukhdev Singh, in the FIR got lodged at his instance, he was an RMP doctor by profession and taken one shop on rent in the house of Paramjit Singh son of Piara Singh, resident of village Nangalguru, Police Station Jandiala. He received threat calls for extortion of an amount of Rs. 5,00,000/-. Out of the demanded amount, total ransom money of Rs. 3,00,000/- were given by him to the accused persons, which he had collected for its use for the marriage of his son Manpreet Singh @ Mani.

Before lodging of the FIR, complainant himself made inquiry at his personal level and then got apprised that Paramjit Singh (from whom he had taken the shop on rent) and his nephew Gurinder Singh son of Gurmeet Singh, and other accomplices, namely, Manpreet Singh @ Preet, Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi, Simranjeet Singh @ Simma, and Ramandeep Singh @ Rama son of Sahib, were involved in raising the demand for ransom, and also taken the ransom amount from him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) refers the order dated 29.11.2024, passed in CRM-M-59701-2024, in the anticipatory bail petition of co-accused Ramandeep Singh; order dated 20.12.2024, passed in CRM-M-63367-2024, in the regular bail petition of co-accused Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi; order dated 15.01.2025, passed in CRM-M-482-2025, in the regular bail petition of co-accused Sharanpreet Singh @ Sharan; and CRM-M-31073-2025, in the regular bail petition of co-accused Sumandeep Singh @ Simma, whereby concession of bail has been extended to the aforementioned co-accused.



**CRM-M-2702-2025 &
CRM-M-55865-2025**

3

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contend that since the allegations qua the present petitioner(s) are almost similar and dispute appears to be amongst the known persons, the story framed by the complainant seems to be concocted one.

Further submits that after investigation, presentation of challan, framing of charges, out of 14 prosecution witnesses, only one has been examined so far, and the trial would take sufficient time to conclude. The petitioner(s) are inside jail for the last 01 year 04 months and 14 days, and they could not be made liable to sit inside jail for any longer period. Therefore, in view of above and claiming parity, learned counsel pray for grant of concession of regular bail to the present petitioner(s).

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s), has not disputed that the petitioner(s) are behind bars for the last 01 year 04 months and 14 days. Learned State counsel also produces custody certificates, dated 21.01.2026, of both the petitioner(s), which are taken on record. Registry to tag the same at appropriate place. As per custody certificate(s), following case(s) were also registered against the petitioner(s):

**Gurwinder Singh @ Grinder Singh @ Ginder Singh
(petitioner in CRM-M-2702-2025):**

1. FIR No. 83, dated 20.09.2022, under Sections 216, 214, 213, 212, 323, 506, 307, 397, 120-B and 34 IPC, Police Station Talwara. Trial pending in the court of Additional Sessions Judge, Hoshiarpur.

Manpreet Singh @ Preet (petitioner in CRM-M-55865-2025):

1. FIR No. 365, dated 23.09.2022, under Sections 394, 323, 325, 148 and 149 IPC, Police Station Goindwal Sahib,



**CRM-M-2702-2025 &
CRM-M-55865-2025**

4

pending in the court of Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Khadoor Sahib. Petitioner is on bail in this case.

2. FIR No. 188, dated 21.07.2024, under Sections 420, 467, 471 and 120-B IPC, Police Station Jandiala, pending the court of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Amritsar. Petitioner is on bail in this case.

Learned State counsel vehemently submits that if the petitioner(s) are granted concession of bail, there is every likelihood that they will either abscond from the trial or again can indulge in similar kind of activities.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record.

5. As per the totality of circumstances, the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner(s), and the factors noticed here-above, it also emerges that the petitioner(s) have already remained in custody for a considerable period, and since the trial is not progressing at the expected pace, their further detention will not serve any fruitful purpose, particularly when similarly placed co-accused have already been granted the concession of bail. Therefore, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner(s). In so far as registration/pendency of other case(s) against the petitioner(s), as pointed out by learned State counsel, is concerned, it is an admitted position that in none of the case they have been convicted so far and trial is going on.

6. Consequently, prayer made in these petitions is allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, by each one of them, if not required in any other case.

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



CRM-M-2702-2025 & 5
CRM-M-55865-2025

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. Both the petitions stand disposed of.
10. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of CRM-M-55865-2025.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

January 22, 2026
P Kapoor

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