



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

CRM-M-28812-2026

Date of decision : 26.05.2026

Gurminder Pal @ Prince

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Pranav Handa Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ekompal Sagoo, AAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.146 dated 27.08.2025, under Sections 308(5), 351(3), 61(2) of the BNS and Sections 25-1B-A, 54, 59 of the Arms Act (added later on), registered at Police Station Sadar Nakodar, District Jalandhar Rural.

2. Succinctly, facts of the present case are that the FIR has been lodged on the statement of Gurpreet Singh. It was alleged that on 09.06.2025, a boy from their village named Prince (present petitioner), son of Satpal, along with his mother Charanjit Kaur and sister Parwinder Kaur lured his daughter Rajveer Kaur with the intention of marriage. They were accompanied by Gural alias Luddhar, son of Hardeep Kumar. It was alleged that on the statement of his wife, namely, Karamjit Kaur's, FIR No. 100 dated 15.06.2025 was registered under Sections 137(2), 96, 61(2), 64(2) BNS at PS Sadar Nakodar and after the case was registered, his daughter returned on 21.06.2025. Following her medical examination,



Section 64(2) BNS and Section 6 of the POCSO Act were added because Prince had established physical relations with her. It was alleged that subsequently, on 29.06.2025, Prince again eloped with his daughter Rajveer Kaur. It was alleged that one person demanded money stating that the complainant's daughter and Prince were in his custody and sent an account number, whereupon, the complainant deposited a sum of Rs.10,000/- into the said account on 30.07.2025. Upon investigating this account, the complainant found that it was of Sukhdeep Singh. When the complainant received a call from the same number again, complainant told to Sukhdeep Singh that he had cheated him, and as a neighbour from Village Gura, he (Sukhdeep Singh) was the one deceiving the complainant. Sukhdeep Singh replied that daughter of the complainant was in Prince's custody, and Prince was a very close friend of him. Sukhdeep Singh threatened the complainant that if the demanded ransom of Rs.3 lakh was not paid, he would face dire consequences, claiming they have links with major gangsters. Hence, request was made to take legal action against the accused. Thus, the FIR was registered. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. Petitioner was arrested on 27.08.2025. On completion of investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. Petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, the said relief was declined vide order dated 11.05.2026. Being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition for grant of regular bail.

3. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case in a



clandestine manner. He has submitted that the petitioner roped in two different FIRs i.e. present FIR No.146 dated 27.08.2025 and FIR No.100 dated 15.06.2025. He has submitted that basically it was the love affair of the petitioner with daughter of the complainant. He has submitted that the FIR No.146 has been lodged by father of the prosecutrix whereas, the FIR No.100 has been lodged by mother of the prosecutrix. He has contended that the allegations against the petitioner in FIR No.100 are not substantiated as the alleged prosecutrix has been examined before the trial Court and she has not supported the case of the prosecution. He has submitted that this Court vide order dated 29.04.2026 passed in CRM-M-18505-2026 has already released the petitioner on bail in FIR No.100. He has submitted that as per the allegations made by the complainant in the present case are also false and frivolous and it is not the petitioner who had made any extortion calls to the complainant rather the same has been made by one Sukhdeep Singh. He has contended that as per the allegations, the petitioner was equally in custody of the person, who allegedly made a ransom call to the complainant. He has contended that only in order to take revenge from the petitioner, he has been implicated in these two FIRs. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel has contended that the petitioner is not involved in any other FIR except these two FIRs and the present FIR is also motivated. He thus, has contended that in the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that daughter of the complainant was minor thus, he has been rightly prosecuted in the FIR



No.100. He has submitted that the complicity of the petitioner surfaced during investigation whereas, the ransom call was made by the co-accused in conspiracy with the petitioner. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of 12 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is facing prosecution in two FIRs lodged by the complainant and his wife i.e. FIR No.146 and FIR No.100 and in FIR No.100, petitioner has already been released on bail. The allegations against the petitioner are pertaining to making extortion calls and the same is against the co-accused Sukhdeep Singh. As contended before this Court that the alleged prosecutrix has not supported the case of the prosecution in FIR No.100 and the petitioner is already released on bail in that case. In the present case, challan is filed, charges have been framed and out of 12 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far. Custody certificate filed by the State shows that the petitioner has undergone incarceration of 08 months and 23 days as on 25.05.2026. Though the custody certificate reflects that the petitioner is in custody in another FIR No.100 dated 15.06.2025, however, the petitioner has been granted bail in the said FIR by this Court vide order dated 29.04.2026 passed in CRM-M-18505-2026.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel

for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

26.05.2026
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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