

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH



1. CRM-M-4360-2026 (O&M)

Parveen Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

2. CRM-M-4945-2026 (O&M)

Shakuntla Devi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

3. CRM-M-4969-2026 (O&M)

Dalip Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	29.04.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	30.04.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	30.04.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Nitesh Jhajharia, Advocate and
Mr. Prativindhya Poonia, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. This common order shall dispose of abovementioned three petitions as they arise out of the same FIR and seek similar relief.
2. Through the instant petitions, filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*for short 'BNSS'*), the petitioners seek grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No. 114 dated 17.08.2025, registered under Sections 308(2) and 351(2) and 61(2) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station City-2 Abohar, District Fazilka.
3. The aforementioned FIR has been registered on the basis of the statement recorded by complainant Tarunjit Singh alleging that on the night of 13.08.2025, he had received a call at his Instagram and the caller, while introducing himself as Jeeta Metal from Waryam Nagar, demanded a sum of Rs. 50 lakhs and otherwise threatened that the complainant would be killed by his accomplices Pardeep Kumar Sappanwali, Jagpal and himself. The complainant pleaded that he was not having such huge amount of money and requested the caller to give some time but the caller proclaimed that he would throw petrol bomb at complainant's house and shops and would kill his entire family. While alleging that he personally knew the caller Gurjit Singh @ Jeeta Metal and his accomplices Pardeep Kumar and Jagpal, the complainant prayed for taking action in the matter while saying that on 14.08.2025, some unknown persons had even visited his mobile shop armed with weapons and had made enquiries about his whereabouts and that he was continuously received threatening calls raising demand of ransom money.
4. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. During investigation, some more persons were

nominated as accused in this case. Accused Akashdeep Singh was arrested on 29.10.2025. On interrogation, he disclosed that accused Naveen Kumar @ Arzoo Bishnoi, who is brother of petitioner Parveen Kumar and son of petitioners Shakuntla Devi and Dalip Kuar, was their gang leader and it was on his asking that they had been making calls to public persons demanding ransom money from them. He also disclosed that ransom calls had been made to the complainant by accused Gurjit Singh @ Jeeta Metal and that the amount of money to be given by the complainant was to be collected by the present petitioners and co-accused Amritpal Singh. All of them were nominated as accused in this case. Apprehending their arrest, the petitioners moved a joint application before the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fazilka but the same was dismissed by passing a common order dated 17.01.2026.

5. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioners that they have been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by the abovenamed co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. Petitioner Parveen Kumar is an Army personnel, whereas petitioners Shakuntla Devi and Dalip Kumar are the parents of accused Naveen Kumar. Their involvement in this case is only on account of their relationship with accused Naveen Kumar, though they have no connection with him. Petitioner Parveen Kumar is presently posted at Dehradun. The petitioners are ready to join the investigation. Their custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from them. No useful purpose would be served by detaining them into custody. Their antecedents are clean. It is, therefore, urged that petitions deserve to be

allowed and the petitioners deserve to be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

6. Status reports have been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that the petitioners are members of a gang, which is involved in extortion of money from public persons by extending threats to them. Their custodial interrogation is required for conducting proper and thorough investigation in the matter. Hence, it is urged that the petitions are liable to be dismissed.

7. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

8. The petitioners are alleged to be part of a gang, mainly operated by accused Naveen Kumar, who is biological son of petitioners Shakuntla Devi and Dalip Kumar and brother of petitioner Parveen Kumar. The allegations that they were to collect the extortion money, have been levelled on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by the abovenamed co-accused. The veracity of this disclosure statement will be tested during the course of trial. It is not the case of the prosecution that any recovery is to be effected from the petitioners. Their antecedents are clean. Given the nature of the allegations, this Court is of the considered opinion that pre-trial incarceration of the petitioners is not required. It is also well settled that the pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. In view thereof, this Court is of the considered opinion that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed. The petitioners are granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the compliance of conditions envisaged under Section 482(2)

of BNSS. They are directed to appear before the Investigating/Arresting Officer to join investigation within a period of 15 days from today or as and when subsequently required thereafter. In the event of their arrest, the Investigating/Arresting Officer shall release the petitioners on bail subject to his/her satisfaction.

9. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petitions and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.
10. Let a photocopy of this order be placed on the files of the connected cases.

30.04.2026
Waseem R. Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>