



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

220

CRM-M-21651-2026  
Date of decision: 19.05.2026

ADHITYA RAI ALIAS ADITIYA RAI

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... RESPONDENT

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH**

Present: Mr. J.S. Thakur, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.**

1. This petition for bail is the first petition, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. This petition has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.64 dated 21.06.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 308(5), 351(3), 61(2) of 'the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023', Police Station City Nakodar, District Jalandhar Rural.



2. The FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Jaidev Kapania', hereinafter being referred to as "complainant" only. It was stated by the above-named complainant that on 12.06.2025 at about 09:54 P.M. when he was present at his shop, he received a call from an unknown person from mobile number +4915218906134, who demanded Rs.1,00,00,000/- and threatened him of dire consequences including death, if the amount was not paid. As per complainant, the caller further warned him to be ready to face gunshot in the morning in case of non-payment. Thereafter, on 13.06.2025 at about 06:16 PM, he again received a call from mobile number +447352610806, wherein the caller demanded money and sent photos of his shop, abused him and threatened to kill him. Upon refusal, the demand was negotiated and settled at Rs.10,00,000/- . Due to fear, the complainant initially remained silent but later, upon discussion with his family members, approached the police.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that pursuant to above-mentioned statement, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. According to prosecution during the course of investigation when the petitioner came to collect money, he was apprehended by the police.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Since advance notice has already been served upon the State, Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Hence, the service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record. No formal reply has been filed by the State. However the learned State counsel has orally opposed the present petition.



6. Heard.

7. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner is innocent, who has been falsely implicated in the present case, and that the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of more than ten months and twenty two days. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate and the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, and that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner. In view of above, the benefit of bail has been sought for the petitioner.

8. The learned State counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel the petitioner is an active member of a gang involved in collecting ransom by extending threat to various persons, and that the petitioner does not have clean antecedents as he is already facing prosecution in similar type of two other cases. It has also been contended by learned State counsel that the involvement of petitioner in the commission of crime is established from the fact that he was caught on the spot when he came to collect the ransom money.

9. The record has been perused carefully.

10. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration for a decision: -

- i) that the allegations against the petitioner are with regard to offence which is triable by Court of Judicial Magistrate but punishable with imprisonment up to ten years;
- ii) that the involvement of petitioner in the commission of



crime is established from the fact that he was caught on the spot when came to collect the ransom money;

- iii) that the petitioner does not have clean antecedents as he is already facing prosecution in similar type of two cases;
- iv) that the period of ten months cannot be treated to be such a long period that this inference may be drawn that the right of personal life and liberty of the petitioner is being violated.

11. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the above-mentioned factors but without commenting anything on the merit of the case, it is hereby observed that at this stage, the petitioner is not entitled to the benefit of bail, and that the present petition is devoid of merit. In view of above, finding no merit, the present petition is hereby **dismissed**, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)  
JUDGE

19.05.2026  
vipin

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |