IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:011046

224 **CRM-M-45122-2025 (O&M)**
Date of decision:27.01.2026

Satgur Singh ... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Dhiraj Jindal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ashwani Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Hittan Nehra, Advocate for the complainant.
...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. Instant petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.91, dated 14.06.2025, registered under Sections 127(2), 308(2), 351(2), 61(2) of the BNS, Section 67 of the Information Technology Act and Section 27 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Urban Estate, Patiala.

2. The aforementioned FIR has been registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant – Jaspreet Singh on 14.06.2025, alleging that on 10/12.04.2025, he received a friend request on his snapchat ID from some female. He had responded to the same. The girl mentioned in the snapchat, disclosed her name as Harshita and induced him to meet her in the market of Urban Estate, Patiala on 03.05.2025 on the premise that she had to come to her friend's birthday. Being so allured,

HARJEET KAUR
2026.01.27 16:43
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

the petitioner went to meet her at the informed place, where the abovesaid girl with the above mentioned name, was found waiting for the complainant while sitting in a verna car. She made him to sit with her in the vehicle by saying that they had to go to a cafe at Sirhind road. While on the way, she got out of the car and 03 youths occupied the vehicle. They covered the eyes of the complainant with a piece of clothing and by putting a pistol on his head, transferred the private data from his mobile phone to their phone. He was taken to some unknown place. Demand of Rs.1 crore was raised from him by extending threats to him. Those persons also made a call on the mobile phone number of his friends and made him to arrange an amount of Rs.25-30 thousand. He was kept in captivated by them and was then released on the next day.

3. As per the further allegations made by the complainant, on 09.06.2025, he received some objectionable video of himself and the female named as Harshita and demand of an amount of Rs.10 lakh was raised by them. He made inquiries at his own level and came to know that real name of that female was Manpreet Kaur and along with her, the present petitioner and co-accused Jugnu Singh @ Kala were also involved at the time of occurrence. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 19.06.2025. Co-accused was subsequently arrested. Investigation now stands completed and the petitioner along with co-accused is facing trial for commission of the aforementioned offences.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is an inordinate delay in lodging

HARJEET KAUR
2026.01.27 16:43
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

of the FIR, which has not been explained by the complainant. As per the allegations made by the complainant himself, the petitioner is his co-villager. However, it is quite improbable that the petitioner was not identified by the complainant at any point of time at the time of occurrence. He is in custody since long. Co-accused Manpreet Kaur has been extended benefit of bail. He is not required for further investigation. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. All the other FIRs, which had been registered against him stand quashed on the basis of compromise. He has clean antecedents. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be extended the benefit of bail.

5. Status report has been filed. Learned State counsel has argued that taking into consideration the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner and the fact that there are chances of the petitioner's intimidating the witnesses, if extended benefit of bail, he does not deserve to be extended the benefit of bail.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

7. Petitioner is alleged to have hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused and in pursuance of that conspiracy, the complainant was allured by co-accused Manpreet Kaur and had been kept confined and money was extorted from him. He is also alleged to have sent threatening messages to the complainant. He is in custody over a period of 07 months. The subject offences are triable by the Magistrate. Investigation stands concluded. However, the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude as none out of 12 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. His

HARJEET KAUR
2026.01.27 16:43
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of bail to him. There is also delay of 41 days in lodging of the FIR. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. As such, a case is made out for grant of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds, to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court, and subject to the condition that he shall not contact the complainant or other material witnesses and shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case. He shall appear before the learned trial Court on each and every date of hearing except when his presence has been exempted by the trial Court. He shall surrender his passport, if any, furnish details of his cell phone and Aadhar card, and shall not change his mobile number(s) during the pendency of the trial.

8. It is clarified that the observations made above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial in any manner.

9. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

27.01.2026

harjeet

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

HARJEET KAUR
2026.01.27 16:43
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document