



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

**CRM-M No.2776 of 2026
Date of decision: 09.04.2026**

ARSHDEEP SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. Dheeraj Kumar, Advocate and
Mr. Chinku Bawa, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition filed under Section 483 BNSS for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.167 dated 11.10.2025 under Sections 308(2), 351(3) and 3(5) of BNS {Sections 111(2)(B) of BNS added later-on} registered at Police Station Badali Ala Singh, Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, the complainant, who is running Meshi Sweets and Dhaba in the market of Chunni Kalan, received a WhatsApp call on 11.10.2025 at about 3:30 P.M. from an unknown mobile number. The caller claimed that he knew the complainant and his business and demanded a ransom of ₹50,00,000/-, threatening that if the amount was not paid, the complainant would not be spared. The complainant disconnected the call, however, thereafter he received a WhatsApp voice message from the said unknown caller, again extending threats to kill him.

It was also noticed that the background voice in the said message indicated



the presence of more than one person.

3. Thereafter, the statement of the complainant was recorded and the FIR was registered. During the course of investigation, the complainant further disclosed that as per information received from his sources, the unknown caller, who is stated to be residing abroad, had procured details regarding his mobile number, his recent purchase of a Fortuner car and his business through the present petitioner Arshdeep Singh. It was alleged that the petitioner, along with some unknown persons, was involved in making ransom calls to the complainant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the only allegation against the petitioner is that he allegedly supplied information regarding the complainant and his vehicle. He has not received any ransom amount in the present case. It is further submitted that the petitioner is in custody for the last five months and fifteen days and, therefore, he deserves to be released on regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail petition and has submitted, on the basis of the status-report, that the information regarding the complainant was provided to the callers by the present petitioner, Arshdeep Singh, who in conspiracy with unknown persons demanded a ransom of ₹50,00,000/-. It is submitted that the petitioner was aware that the complainant had purchased a new car. The petitioner obtained the complainant's mobile number and information regarding the purchase of the new car from one Navjot Singh, who used to visit him, and thereafter, supplied the said information to the callers, pursuant to which the offence was committed. It is thus contended that the



allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and he is not entitled to be released on bail. It is further submitted that the other co-accused are yet to be arrested in the present case.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record, this Court is of the considered view that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are grave and serious. The material on record *prima-facie* indicates that the petitioner played a significant role in facilitating the commission of the offence by providing crucial information regarding the complainant, which was subsequently used for making ransom calls. Offences relating to ransom and extortion are on the rise and have serious implications on the safety and security of individuals in society. Such crimes are often carried out in an organized manner and involve multiple persons acting in concert.

7. Considering the nature of allegations, the role attributed to the petitioner, and the fact that other co-accused are yet to be arrested, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

8. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

09.04.2026

neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No