



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-24468 of 2026

Date of Decision: 02.07.2026

Gurinder Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Mr. Shivam Chaudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Deepali Verma, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana, for the respondent.

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'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No. 04 dated 03.01.2026, for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s) 308(2), 308(4), 351(2) & 61(2) of 'the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023' Police Station Siwan, District Kaithal, Haryana.

2. The FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Balwinder Singh', hereinafter being referred to as "complainant" only. It was alleged by the above named complainant that on two occasions, i.e. on 02.01.2026 & 03.01.2026 he received WhatsApp calls from a foreign based mobile number and the caller claimed himself to be a member of 'Bambiha Gang'. According to complainant the caller demanded a ransom of

₹50,00,000/- from him and threatened that in case of non-payment of above-mentioned ransom he would be killed.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that pursuant to above-mentioned complaint, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. According to prosecution during the course of investigation on the basis of secret information the accused, namely 'Jatinder Singh', 'Gurinder Singh' (the petitioner herein) and 'Pawandeep Singh' were arrested. The prosecution has further alleged that the co-accused 'Jatinder Singh' was responsible for conducting reconnaissance of the house and shop of the complainant and he transmitted the photographs and videos to the main accused. As per prosecution the present petitioner and 'Pawandeep Singh' were actively involved in the commission of above-mentioned offence and they were in constant touch with each other through various mobile applications, for passing the information.

4. Heard.

5. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that no reliable evidence, whatsoever, has been collected by the Investigating Agency against the petitioner and the prosecution case is solely resting upon the disclosure statement of petitioner and his co-accused. With regard to above, it has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the above-mentioned disclosure statements are inadmissible in evidence, as the above-mentioned statements were recorded when the makers of the same were already in police custody and pursuant to above-mentioned disclosure statements discovery of any fact, pertaining to instance case, has not taken place.

6. In addition to above the learned counsel for the petitioner has also contended that the petitioner is innocent having no criminal antecedents, and that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. It has been further contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the offence is otherwise triable by the court of Judicial Magistrate, and that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner and therefore, he is entitled to the benefit of bail.

7. The learned State counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. It has been contended by the learned State counsel that instant case is a case pertaining to the menace of demand of ransom from affluent families, by various gangs in the State. As per learned State counsel the *modus operandi* adopted by the above said gangs, for collecting ransom, is that the king-pin or the prime members of the gangs are based in foreign country from where they make calls and demand ransom from the members of affluent families. According to learned State counsel in order to gather information, terrorise the family members of the victim and collect ransom, they engage young persons as foot soldiers, who provide them each and every assistance/information including the details of movements of the victim, his resources and other vital details. It has also been contended by learned State counsel that in the present case the mobile phone of the petitioner has been seized by the police officials, and that on examination of above-mentioned mobile phones it has been found that the mobile phone of the petitioner was used for passing over information to the gang members based in foreign countries. The learned State counsel has further contended that during the course of investigation the accused 'Gurinder Singh' (the

petitioner herein) son of Khushdev Singh resident Dinanagar District Gurdaspur handed over one Android mobile to the investigating officer, and that on checking of mobile one SIM bearing No. 9056326311 Airtel, has been found active therein, and that Social Media Apps, like WhatsApp, Instagram and Snapchat etc. were installed therein. According to learned State counsel WhatsApp account was found registered on no. 9056326311, and that on dialing #6261#, Instagram and WhatsApp accounts were found in Hidden Apps.

8. The learned State counsel has further contended that in the above-mentioned mobile phone eight Instagram accounts, namely 'khatarnak_jattii_23', 'raja_gurdaspuria', 'khatarnak_jatt22', 'jassleen_.bajwa', 'simarn5117', 'jaiseen_bajwa', 'zulmi_jatt_123', and 'kille_rqueen9787' have been found active, and that on Instagram contact of 'Gurinder Singh' was connected with accounts, namely 'jaggu.bhagwanpuria.0001', 'noor_bhagwanpuri', and 'king.of punjab302'. As per learned State counsel on inspection of mobile phones, recovered from the petitioner and his co-accused, it has been found that apprehended boy, namely 'Jitender' through 'Signal App' had sent videos and photographs of complainant's shop and houses to accused, who demanded ransom from the complainant.

9. In addition to above the learned State counsel has also contended that in the mobile phone recovered from the possession of petitioner, it has been found that there are many links along with the main accused, and that in the mobile phones of 'Pawandeep Singh' and 'Gurinder Singh' many links with main accused, demanding ransom, were found on

Instagram and Social Media platform and all three persons were found connected with each other. As per learned State counsel, during the course of investigation the accused, namely 'Jitender', 'Pawandeep Singh' and 'Gurinder Singh' have been thoroughly interrogated, one by one, and all of them have got recorded their separate disclosure statements, wherein 'Pawandeep Singh' and 'Gurinder Singh' disclosed that they have association with 'Noor Bhagwanpuria', who is operating from abroad and managing activities of the gang through social media platforms and encrypted applications. According to learned State counsel, the above-mentioned accused have also admitted that Instagram IDs, including 'jaggu_bhagwanpuria006', have been created and operated at the instance of 'Noor' for communication and coordination among gang members. It has been further contended that both the accused have further disclosed that 'Noor Bhagwanpuria' had assigned them the task of extorting ₹50,00,000/- from 'Balvinder Singh' of village Kangthali, District Kaithal, Haryana, and further directed that firing could be carried out at the house of the victim in case of non-payment.

10. In view of above-mentioned argument, it has been contended by learned State counsel that prime role in the execution of plan of extorting money from the victim has been attributed to the petitioner and if the petitioner is released on bail it will have such a negative psychological impact on the victim's family, that they may not come forward to support the prosecution case during the course of trial. According to learned State counsel, otherwise also once released on bail there is every likelihood that the petitioner will influence the witnesses and therefore, at this stage, when

the statement of prime witnesses are yet to be recorded, the petitioner is not entitled to the benefit of bail.

11. The record has been perused carefully.

12. A perusal of the record shows that there are several factors which are required to be taken into consideration at this stage. Those factors are:-

- i) that there are specific and categorical allegations against the petitioner that he was in touch with the prime accused who was responsible for collecting information with regard to resources/means and whereabouts of the victim and thereafter the demand of ransom was made from the victim;
- ii) that the recovery of mobile phone from the possession of petitioner, which was used for installation of mobile applications used for communicating and pass over information to the main accused, establishes the direct link between the commission of offence and the present petitioner;
- iii) that the release of petitioner on bail is likely to have a negative impact on the confidence of the victim in the justice delivery system, who are facing threats for ransom. Thus, at this stage release of petitioner on bail shall not be in the fitness of the things.

13. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the above-discussed factors, the gravity of offence and the direct link between the

commission of crime and the present petitioner, it is hereby observed that the present petitioner is not entitled to the benefit of bail and the above-mentioned petition is devoid of merits. Hence, the present petition is hereby **dismissed**, accordingly.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

July 02, 2026
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No