

2026:PHHC:003064



IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-48238-2025 (O&M)

Satnam Singh @ Harpreet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	13.01.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	14.01.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	15.01.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. B. S. Kundra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

- Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No. 208 dated 30.10.2024, registered under Sections 333, 308(5), 308(4), 308(6), 309(2) and 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station City Rupnagar.
- The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of the statement recorded by complainant Kulwant Singh alleging therein that he was a retired person and was residing along with his younger son as his wife had

2026:PHHC:003064



died. He was in search of a housemaid for doing domestic works. One of his acquaintances had given him the contact number of one Reshma. On being called by him, she came to his house on 10.02.2023 and by assuring that she would be joining the next day, she left. On 11.02.2023, she came and started working in the house of the complainant. When someone knocked at the door, the complainant opened the gate and saw the petitioner, who introduced himself as a Press Reporter. He started saying that the complainant had abducted a woman and had kept her confined and had also committed rape upon her. He was carrying a cellphone and started making a video with the same after forcibly entering inside. Thereafter, he showed a pistol to the complainant and told him to follow his instructions. The complainant was forced to remove his lower clothing. Accused Reshma, in connivance with the petitioner, also removed her clothing and a video of the complainant with Reshma was prepared by the petitioner in that condition. Thereafter, both, the petitioner and co-accused Reshma, extended threats to upload the said video on social media and demanded a sum of Rs. 4 Lakhs, otherwise they would disrepute the complainant. They took away cash amount of Rs.3 Lakhs and gold ornaments lying in his house and withdrew an amount of Rs.1 Lakh from his ATM. Thereafter, both of them started blackmailing him through phone by posing themselves as police officers and also extended threats to kill his son and himself. In this manner, they extorted an amount of Rs.43,89,005/- from the complainant. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner and co-accused Reshma were arrested on 30.10.2024. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been

2026:PHHC:003064



falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 30.10.2024. He is not required for further investigation. Material facts have been concealed. In fact, the petitioner and the complainant are related to each other. They had monetary transactions with each other. He had lent money to the complainant and when he demanded the same back, then instead of returning the same, the complainant has falsely implicated him in this case. No such video recording allegedly prepared by the petitioner has been recovered. There is delay of one year and nine months in reporting the matter to the police. The conclusion of trial would take considerable time. The petitioner has clean antecedents. No useful purpose would be served by his further incarceration. The complainant already stands examined and, therefore, there are no chances of his intimidating him. The petitioner has a permanent abode. There are no chances of his absconding. It is, therefore, stressed that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. There are chances of his intimidating the other witnesses or absconding, if released on bail. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner along with co-accused Reshma is alleged to have extorted a huge amount of money from the complainant by putting him in fear. The allegations make out a prima facie case for commission of subject offences against the petitioner. However, he is in custody since 30.10.2024.

The FIR in this case was registered after a gap of one year and nine months

2026:PHHC:003064



from the date of incident. Only four out of total fourteen witnesses have been examined so far and, therefore, the chances of conclusion of trial in near future are bleak. The complainant already stands examined and hence, it cannot be stated that he would be intimidated by the petitioner. The well settled proposition of law is that pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. It is equally well settled that the bail is rule and jail is an exception. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that a case for grant of regular bail has been made in favour of the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

14.01.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No