

2026:PHHC:052277



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

116

**CRM-M-41394-2025
Date of decision: 01.04.2026**

GAGANDEEP SINGH @ GARIBU AND ANOTHERPetitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

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

Present: - Mr. Jaskaran Singh, Advocate (Legal Aid Counsel).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant first petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 148 dated 02.12.2024, registered under Section(s) 125, 308(6) of BNS and Section 25(6)(7) of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Phase 11, District SAS Nagar.

2. It is noticed by this Court that the instant petition had been filed by Mr. Dheeraj Jindal, Advocate, however, on 10.11.2025, he had sought time. The matter was adjourned to 21.01.2026 on which date one Mr. Ashish Soi, Advocate entered appearance on behalf of the petitioners and filed his power of attorney. On his request, the matter was adjourned to 16.03.2026.

On the said date, one Ms. Amandeep Kaur Advocate, entered appearance on behalf of the petitioner and claimed that she had been engaged by the party in the morning and sought time to complete instructions. The matter was thus adjourned to 20.03.2026 but none has appeared on behalf of the petitioners on the said date of hearing despite the matter having been called twice. In the interest of justice, however, the matter was listed for today.

3. Even today no one has entered appearance on behalf of the petitioners despite the matter having been called twice. Further wait is not justified. Hence, this Court appoints Mr. Jaskaran Singh, Advocate, Enrollment No. 12060-2025, Mobile No. 9115652108, who is present in the Court as a Legal Aid Counsel to assist this Court on behalf of the petitioners. He has gone through the copy of the paper book that was supplied by learned State Counsel during the course of the day and upon perusal thereof, he submits that the FIR in the present case has been registered on the basis of an application received from one Amandeep Singh. The same reads thus:-

“To, Chief Officer, Police Station Phase-11, District SAS Nagar. Subject: Regarding threats and firing:- Dear Sir, I request that I am Amandeep Singh son of Harjit Singh resident of GBD, 001, One Rise Apartment, Sector-99, Mohali and I am running a workshop named Steer X Automo in Phase-9 Industrial Area, Mohali. Last night on 01-12-2024, due to my health not being good, I went to bed early. When I woke up in the morning, I received a video on WhatsApp from an unknown number +351 922 252 773, in which an unknown person is firing in my workshop, Plot No. 564B, Phase-9, Ind. Area, Mohali, 4 bullets, with a pistol and had sent me messages "Aman ji fn chako, Ah video dekh le, Aman Davinder Bambiha Group, Tere to 50 Lakh lene je ne devesa ta hun goli tere vaju" and threatened to kill me and threatened to shoot me if I did not

give a ransom of Rs. 50 lakh. Please take appropriate legal action against the unknown person.”

4. It is submitted by the learned Counsel that as per the averments contained, no offence of any nature whatsoever is made out against the petitioners, as their identity has not been established. It is further submitted that the FIR has been registered solely on the basis of a WhatsApp call received which such call cannot be attributed to the petitioners herein. He submits that the petitioners were taken in custody on 09.01.2025. The investigation in the case is complete and that they are no longer required to be retained in custody.

5. Counsel for the respondent-State on the other hand contends that it is an extortion case, where the petitioners threatened the complainant and raised a demand of Rs. 50 lakhs. They also shared a WhatsApp video of shots being fired at the shop in order to create fear that in case demand is not met, the next shot would be fired upon the complainant himself. He further contends that there are six other cases that have been registered against petitioner No.1 while 07 cases have been registered against petitioner No.2. The nature of involvement pertains to heinous offences as well. It is submitted that given the criminal antecedents of the petitioners and their involvement in such similar offences, they do not deserve the concession of bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and taking into consideration the repeated involvement of the petitioner in multiple heinous offences including offences under Section 395, 365 IPC; 307 IPC and considering that the petitioner No.1 is involved in six other cases while petitioner No.2 is involved in 07 other cases, I of the

opinion that no grounds for bail is made out, hence, the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

7. A copy of this order be sent to the High Court Legal Service Committee for information and necessary action.

APRIL 01, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No