



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

233

CRM-M No.26129 of 2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 02.07.2026

Prabhjeet Badhan @ Honey @ Prabhjit Badhan**.....Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH****Present:** Mr. Dharam Bir Bhargav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Aakanksha Gupta, AAG, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

This is first petition for bail, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the 'Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023'. This petition pertains to a case arising out of FIR No.8 dated 10.01.2026, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 125 & 62 [Section 308(2) added later on] of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023 and Section 25 of Arms Act, Police Station Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur.

2. The above mentioned FIR came into being at the instance of 'Avtar Kaur', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the complainant that on the intervening night of 09/10, January 2026, unknown persons fired gunshots outside her house. It was further alleged that earlier also on 27.12.2025, some unknown persons had fired gun-shots outside her house. As per complainant, threatening calls were also received on WhatsApp from an international number.



3. It is the case of the prosecution that pursuant to abovementioned complaint, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. As per prosecution, during the course of investigation the complainant suffered supplementary statement on 22.01.2026 and disclosed that co-accused 'Karan Partap' had committed the abovementioned offence on the instructions of his friend 'Sushant Chopra', resident of USA. Accordingly, co-accused 'Karan Partap' was arrested and during the course of interrogation he suffered a disclosure statement wherein he revealed that he alongwith 'Honey @Ada' had fired gun-shots outside the house of complainant on the intervening night of 09/10 January 2026 and on 27.12.2025.

4. The learned State counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner and reply to the petition. The same be taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is a young innocent boy having no criminal history, and that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. According to learned counsel for the petitioner there is no evidence, worth believable, against the petitioner, and that, whatever, evidence has been collected by the investigating agency against the petitioner, the same is inadmissible in evidence. According to learned counsel for the petitioner the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate for which the maximum punishment prescribed under the law is imprisonment up to seven years. As per learned counsel for the petitioner since the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future the petitioner is



entitled to the benefit of bail.

7. The learned State counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments. It has been contended by the learned State counsel that present case is a case which was very serious implication on the affluent section of the society from whom the gangsters settled in foreign country, are demanding ransom. As per learned State counsel in order to terrorize the affluent families they are engaging the local youths for gathering information, firing gun-shots and collecting ransom. According to learned State counsel in order to save themselves from the clutches of law the kingpin of the gang is staying in foreign country from where he makes ransom calls and in order to execute his plan the petitioner and other young boys have been made the tools.

8 The learned State counsel has further contended that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is likely to indulge in similar activities, and thus, pursuing the illicit goals of the gangsters involved in collecting ransom. It has also been contended by the learned State counsel that in the present case the statement of material witnesses are yet to be recorded and if before the recording of statement of material witnesses the benefit of bail is accorded to the petitioner, it will definitely impact the confidence of the complainant and her family in the process of law, which may ultimately result into a fatal blow to the prosecution case. In view of above, the learned State counsel has sought for dismissal of above mentioned application.

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 allegations against the petitioner are that he is a member of a gang who is involved in demanding ransom from the family of complainant and for the above said purpose a foreign based co-accused is calling the family members of the complainant;
- ii) that there are allegations that in order to terrorize the family of the complainant and show their impact, on two occasions gunshots have been fired at the residence of the complainant;
- iii) that if released on bail there is every likelihood that the petitioner would indulge in pressurizing the complainant and other witnesses, from deposing against them.

11. Taking into consideration the gravity of offence allegedly committed by the petitioner, the direct nexus of the petitioner with the commission of offence and the above discussed factors, it is hereby observed that the petitioner is not entitled to the benefit of bail and the present petition deserves dismissal. The same is hereby dismissed, accordingly.

12. However, it is clarified that the abovementioned observations shall not have any bearing upon the merits of the case.

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

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

02.07.2026

Manoj Bhutani

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