



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

124+130

1)

CRM-M-49900-2025
Decided on : 17.03.2026

Karajpreet Singh @ Karaj

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

2)

CRM-M-63086-2025

Sajandeep Singh @ Kalu

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. M.S. Hundal, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-49900-2025).

Mr. Nitin Narula, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-63086-2025).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of CRM-M-49900-2025 & CRM-M-63086-2025, as both the petitions are interconnected and have arisen out of same FIR. However, the lead case is CRM-M-49900-2025.

2. The instant petitions have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Karajpreet Singh @ Karaj (petitioner in CRM-M-49900-2025	86	28.06.2025	308(4) of BNS, 2023	Kathu Nangal	Amritsar Rural
Sajandeep	86	28.06.2025	308(4) of BNS, 2023	Kathu	Amritsar

Singh @ Kalu (petitioner in CRM-M-63086- 2025)				Nangal	Rural
---	--	--	--	--------	-------

3. Case of the prosecution, as detailed in the status report is that on 26.06.2025, after closing the shop, when complainant – Jajj Singh, went to his house, at about 10:21 PM, he received a call on his mobile No. 98783-21937 showing (Private Number) and on attending a call, the person on the other side demanded Rs. 10 Lakh from him. He further alleged that at 10:23 PM, he again received a call from private number and the person from other side told that his persons will come after two days to collect Rs. 10 Lakh and on 27.06.2025 at about 10:07 PM, he received a whatsapp call from mobile No. +12369785975 and demanded Rs. 10 Lakh and today i.e., 28.06.2025, he again received a similar extortion call and some unidentified person had made extortion calls to him. The detailed facts mentioned by the complainant in his aforesaid statement has been reproduced in the true translation of the FIR No.86, dated 28.06.2025 attached with the petition as Annexure P-1.

During investigation, complainant came forwarded himself and got recorded a supplementary statement dated 29.06.2025, alleging therein that he has enquired on his own that Sajan alias Kalu along with Pawanpreet Singh, Karajpreet Singh (petitioner) and Nirvail Singh in connivance and conspiring with each other has demanded extortion of Rs. 10 Lakh from him. On the basis of the aforesaid supplementary statement, the petitioner, co-accused Pawanpreet Singh, Sajan and Nirvail Singh was nominated in the present case vide G.D No. 30 dated 29.06.2025.

4. Thereafter, petitioner – Karajpreet Singh @ Karaj (in CRM-M-49900-2025) and co-accused – Pawanpreet Singh @ Pawan (who has already been released on bail) were arrested on 29.06.2025, and a 12 bore double

barrel rifle along with 05 live cartridges was recovered from co-accused – Pawanpreet Singh @ Pawan. During investigation, one Samsung Mobile M16, allegedly used for making extortion calls, was also recovered from the said co-accused.

5. Primary argument raised by learned counsel for petitioner – Karajpreet Singh @ Karaj (in CRM-M-49900-2025) as well as learned counsel for petitioner – Sajandeep Singh @ Kalu (in CRM-M-63086-2025) is that co-accused – Pawanpreet Singh @ Pawan has already been granted concession of regular bail by the Court of Sessions vide order dated 30.10.2025 (Annexure A-1 in CRM-M-49900-2025), and since the role attributed to the present petitioners is similar in nature, they are also entitled to the same concession on the ground of parity.

It is further argued that the offences alleged are triable by the Court of the learned Magistrate and both the petitioners are inside the jail for a period of more than 08 months. Thus, it is contended that they cannot be kept behind bars for an indefinite period.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed two separate custody certificates dated 16.03.2026 in Court today, which are taken on record. The office is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place.

Copies thereof have been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioners.

7. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that there are specific allegations against the petitioners and that they are involved in disturbing the peaceful atmosphere of the society. It is further submitted that keeping in view the nature of allegations and the gravity of the offence, the petitioners do not deserve any leniency. Accordingly, prayer has been made for dismissal of the present petitions.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the relevant material available on record.

9. At this stage, without commenting upon the merits of the case, it is noticed that the present petitioners have been nominated in the case primarily on the basis of the supplementary statement of the complainant recorded during the course of investigation. It is also a matter of record that the alleged recovery of weapon as well as the mobile phone used for making extortion calls has been effected from co-accused – Pawanpreet Singh @ Pawan, who has already been granted the concession of regular bail by the Court of Sessions.

Besides, role attributed to the present petitioners appears to be similar in nature and, therefore, they are entitled to consideration on the ground of parity. It is further not disputed that the offences alleged are triable by the Court of the learned Magistrate.

It is also a matter of record that both the petitioners are inside the jail for a period of more than 08 months and the trial is likely to take time to conclude.

10. Keeping in view the period of incarceration, the stage of trial, the principle of parity, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioners inside the jail for an indefinite period. Accordingly, this Court deems it a fit case for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioners.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions are **allowed**. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in

any other case.

11. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

12. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

Petitions stand disposed of.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

March 17, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*