



118

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51158-2025
Decided on : 10.03.2026

Amandeep Singh @ Metro and another . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. HPS Ghuman, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. H.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has 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
Amandeep Singh @ Metro and Harvinder Singh	100	10.07.2025	308(4), 326(g), 351(3), 61(2) of BNS, 2023	Doraha	Ludhiana

2. FIR in question has been lodged by Bakhshish Singh with averment that he owns a mobile phone with Sim no.98151-41822. Said mobile number is working for the last 15-20 years. Complainant is an agriculturist and runs JCB machine and Tipper for Agricultural purposes. He started receiving calls from different mobile no. +39 379 160 7342 and +351



920 673 752. These calls were made by Jatinder Kumar alias Tiddi Baman from U.S.A. He threatened Complainant that he is in knowledge of his business and his family members. He demanded a sum of Rs.10 lakhs. On 07.08.2025 Complainant alongwith his worker Permod Singh was present his residence. He again received a phone call at 09:00 AM from Whatsapp mobile phone no.+(437) 808-3420. Jatinder Kumar alias Tiddi Baman threatened Complainant and demanded Rs:10 lakhs. Complainant was threatened that in case he does not pay extortion money of Rs.10 lakhs then Complainant and his family member will be harmed and Tipper and vehicles owned by him will get burnt. Thereafter phone call was disconnected. Complainant alongwith his worker Permod Singh was going to Ludhiana. His Tipper bearing no. PB-10FV-5022 make Tata was standing at brick Kiln. Driver Kulwinder Singh was sleeping in cabin of Tipper. At 05:00 PM one white colour Swift car bearing no. PB-08EU-3132 and Innova car with incomplete no.PB-10-EEO and number of unnumbered motorcycles driven by unidentified person came there. All of them threw patrol Bomb inside the cabin of Tipper owned by Complainant. It put Tipper on fire. Driver Kulwinder Singh some how saved his life. Entire cabin and seats were completely burnt. Fire was extinguished by Labourers and Driver. Thereafter Complainant received phone call from Jatinder alias Tiddi. He told Complainant that today one of the Tipper owned by him has been put on fire. Subsequently other Tippers will also be burnt. It was found that caller Jatinder Kumar alias Tiddi Baman from U.S.A was carrying surveillance upon Complainant through Rajveer Singh alias Balio, Amandeep Singh alias Metro and unknown persons in India to compel



Complainant to pay extortion money of Rs.10 lakhs.

3. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner produced a copy of the statement dated 02.03.2026 of the complainant – Bakshish Singh, who appeared as PW-1 and clearly denied having lodged any complaint with the police. Not only this, while deposing in his examination-in-chief, he stated that ***“accused present in the Court through V/C have committed no offence.”***

Thereupon, the learned Public Prosecutor got the witness declared hostile and conducted his cross-examination.

4. Examination-in-chief got recorded by the complainant – Bakshish Singh (PW-1) reads as under:-

“Stated that I resident of above said address. Nothing has been happened in my presence. I never made any complaint to the police nor I had recorded my statement with the police. Accused present in the court through V/C have committed no offence.

At this stage Ld. APP for the State requested that witness is deliberately suppressing the truth and he resiling from his previous statement to the police and therefore he may declared hostile and permission be granted to prosecution to cross examine his.”

Thus, learned counsel submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case by concocting the allegations. Therefore, he prays for grant of the concession of regular bail to the petitioners.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the plea for bail, submits that the allegations are very serious in nature and that such crimes are on the rise, particularly in this part of the country. However, he could not controvert the fact that the complainant – Bakshish Singh has



himself turned hostile.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the complainant submits that he has no objection if the petitioners are granted the concession of regular bail in the present case.

7. I have considered the submissions addressed by the respective learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on the case file.

8. It may be a situation that the complainant has turned hostile for more than one reason and, therefore, has not supported the case of the prosecution. However, the allegations are required to be established by the prosecution beyond reasonable doubt, which would primarily depend upon the technical and documentary evidence rather than solely on the oral allegations. The said aspect, however, is to be examined after the entire evidence is adduced before the learned trial Court.

9. Taking note of the fact that the complainant – Bakshish Singh has not supported the case of the prosecution and has rather stated that the petitioners have not committed any offence, I do not find any substantial reason to continue the detention of the petitioners inside jail for any longer.

Therefore, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, and keeping in view the settled principles governing grant of bail, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioners.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **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.

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

11. 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.

12. Petition stands **disposed of**.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 10, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*