

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

224

2026 PHHC 073305



CRM-M-25362-2026 (O&M).
Date of decision: 11.05.2026.

HARJIT SINGH ALIAS HARRY

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

PRESENT Mr. Gurmeet Singh Saini,, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This is the first petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in
case bearing FIR No.0043 dated 20.02.2026, under Section(s) 308(4) and
351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station
Makhu, District Ferozepur.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that
as per the case of the prosecution Daljeet Singh son of Baghel Singh moved a

complaint that on 11.02.2026, he had received a telephone call from Mobile No.9988515564 and that a ransom demand of ₹50 Lakhs had been made from him. He contends that he had again received a threat and ransom call from mobile No.6280079880 on the basis whereof the aforesaid FIR was registered. He contends that on 21.02.2026, supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded to the effect that as per his knowledge, the calls and messages were sent by the petitioner herein along with co-accused Sukhwinder Singh. He contends that even though the whatsapp call was allegedly received on 11.02.2026, however, the matter was reported to the police after a delay of 09 days. He contends that complete disclosure has not been made by the complainant. It is submitted that the petitioner had executed a sale deed of his land measuring 01 kanal and 17 marlas in favour of wife of the complainant on 24.12.2024. He contends that the collectorate rate of the land was ₹11 lakhs and the complainant had issued a cheque of ₹2,55,000/- in favour of the petitioner and the remaining amount was payable, however, the same was not released despite an assurance made by the complainant (who is related to the petitioner herein) to pay the remaining amount in cash after registration of the sale deed. He contends that the complainant, however, delayed the release of the payment and that the present case has been got registered solely to evade the payment from the balance amount of the sale transaction by exaggerating the allegations. It is contended that the petitioner has clean antecedents and no further recovery is to be effected from him. He contends that the petitioner is in custody since 21.02.2026 and the final report, after completion of investigation, has already been filed.

State counsel, on the other hand, does not dispute the facts as noticed above including the period of custody and the stage of the trial.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, without commenting any further on the merits of the case and taking into consideration that arguable issues would arise with respect to the involvement of the petitioner in the light of the property transaction between the petitioner and the complainant and that the complete sale consideration had not been transferred, his clean antecedents and that the petitioner is no longer required for investigation of the case including the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

May 11, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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