

2026:PHHC:069971



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-6064-2026

Gurjeet Singh @ Jeeta Mental

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	05.05.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	07.05.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	07.05.2026
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: Ms. Riffi Birla, Advocate and
Mr. Shivam, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vivek Sharma, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 114 dated 17.08.2025 registered under Sections 308(2) and 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNS’) at Police Station City-2, Abohar, District

2026 PHHC 069971



Fazilka.

2. The aforementioned FIR was 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 ID and the caller, while introducing himself as Jeeta, i.e. the present petitioner, 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 petitioner 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.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. 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 accused Parveen Kumar and son of Shakuntla Devi and Dalip Kaur, 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

2026.PHHC.069971



disclosed that ransom calls had been made to the complainant by the petitioner and that the amount of money to be given by the complainant was to be collected by Shakuntla Devi, Parveen Kumar, Dalip Kumar and Amritpal Singh. All of them were nominated as accused in this case and they have been extended benefit of anticipatory bail.

4. During the course of investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 29.08.2025. It was revealed that he had made Instagram call to the complainant on 13.08.2025 and had demanded an amount of Rs. 50 lakhs and had extended threats to otherwise to eliminate the complainant and his family members. It was also revealed that he had visited the mobile phone shop of the complainant on 14.08.2025. Investigation qua the petitioner now stands concluded and challan has been presented in the Court.

5. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. No material has been collected by the Investigating Agency to prove that he had ever made any call from his Instagram ID to the complainant. No recovery has been effected from him. He is in custody since long. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody anymore. The co-accused Randeep Singh has been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be released on bail. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of bail to him. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while relying upon the status

2026.PHHC.069971



report has argued that the petitioner is a habitual offender being involved in five other cases. Presently, he is lodged in Shimla Jail. The allegations against him are serious in nature. There are chances of his absconding, committing similar offences or intimidating the witnesses, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

8. The petitioner is alleged to be a member of a gang involved in committing offences of extortion of ransom money from the public persons by extending threats to them. He is also alleged to have given such threats to the complainant by making a call to him through his Instagram ID. It is, however, only a matter of the evidence as to whether, such call had been made from his Instagram ID. No recovery has been effected from the petitioner. He is in custody since 29.08.2025. He is not required for further investigation. The trial will take considerable time to conclude as no prosecution witness has been examined so far. There is no basis of contention that he might commit similar offences or intimidate the witnesses. It is well settled proposition of law that pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentence and that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. It is equally well settled proposition of law that the object of jail is to secure the appearance of the accused during the trial and it can neither be punitive nor preventive and the deprivation of liberty has been considered as a punishment. Keeping in view the period of incarceration of the petitioner, the nature of subject offence

2026 PHHC 069971



and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

7th May, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |