



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

224

**CRM-M-14939-2026 (O&M)
Decided on : 12.05.2026**

Rahul Chaudhary @Chucha

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Sandeep Godara, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Bansal, Sr. DAG Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

Receipt regarding deposit of costs of Rs.2500/-, imposed vide order dated 28.04.2026, has been placed on record.

2. This petition for bail is the first petition, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.214 dated 08.12.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 308(4), 351(3), 61(2) and 62 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, hereinafter being referred to as 'BNS', Police Station Division No.2, District Pathankot.

3. The abovementioned FIR came into being at the instance of 'Raj Kumar @Raju', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the above-named complainant that he was a property dealer by profession, and that about 15 days ago, 'Rahul @Chucha' (the petitioner



herein) with whom he was acquainted, came to him and stated that his (complainant's) photograph had reached to a gangster living abroad, and that the abovesaid photograph was sent by someone known to the complainant.

4. It was further stated by the complainant that thereafter, on 04.12.2025 at about 07:00 pm, he received a WhatsApp call from mobile No.+447300974760 and the caller identified himself as 'Aman Gotan', belonging to 'Harry Chadda Group'. As per complainant, the caller demanded a ransom of Rs.20 lacs and threatened that if the money was not paid, the complainant would be harmed. It was further stated by the complainant that similar call was received by him on 08.12.2025 at about 02:30 pm from mobile No.+447440572517.

5. It is the case of the prosecution that pursuant to abovementioned statement, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

6. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record. The status report has already been filed. The same, too, be taken on record.

7. Heard.

8. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of more than three months and twenty six days, and that he has been implicated in the present case, without any legally admissible evidence. It has also been contended by



learned counsel for the petitioner that the only evidence collected against the petitioner is the disclosure statement of co-accused and the confessional statement of petitioner, and therefore, the instant case is a case, wherein virtually there is no evidence against the petitioner. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner, and that detention of the petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future and therefore, the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.

9. The learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments. The learned State Counsel has contended that the petitioner is a person, who has a history of involvement in criminal cases, and that in addition to present case, the petitioner is already facing prosecution in three other cases, including a case under NDPS Act and another case under Section 109 of BNS. It has also been contended by learned State Counsel that ample evidence has been collected by the Investigating Agency during the course of investigation, including the evidence showing the group call between the petitioner and other gang member, namely 'Rajbir'.

10. It has also been contended by learned State Counsel that the evidence has been collected showing that a sum of Rs.60,000/- was paid by petitioner's cousin, namely 'Deepak Kumar', to 'Rajbir', the another co-accused, who further transferred Rs.5,000/- to 'Rahul' for collecting the



photo of complainant. As per learned State Counsel, the petitioner belongs to a gang comprising of 'Rahul', 'Rajbir' and 'Aman Gotan', known as 'Harry Chadda Group', and that they are involved in the activities of threatening businessmen of the area and extorting money from them. While claiming that the entire case is yet to be unfolded, the learned State Counsel has sought for dismissal of present petition.

11. The record has been perused carefully.

12. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, although the name of the petitioner is not mentioned in the FIR, but during the course of investigation, the case has been developed, which shows that the petitioner was in constant touch with 'Rajbir', who is staying in a foreign country.

13. In addition to above, the past conduct of the petitioner is also not clean, as he has been found involved in four other cases, out of which three are still pending.

14. As far as the plea with regard to delay in trial is concerned, a perusal of record shows that the total custody period of petitioner is not even four months, and the abovementioned period by any standard cannot be treated to be a period, which may invite an inference that there is delay in trial.

15. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the abovementioned factors, it is hereby held that at this stage, the petitioner is

not entitled for the benefit of bail, and that the present petition being devoid of merit deserves dismissal.

16. Hence, finding no merit, the present petition is hereby *dismissed*.

17. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

12.05.2026
Gaurav Thakur

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