



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-52666 of 2025 (O&M)

**Reserved On: 15.01.2026
Pronounced On: 28.01.2026**

Devender Soni

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Mr. Aditya Sanghi and Mr. Shivam Jindal, Advocates
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Deepali Verma, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana, for the respondent.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 111(3), 308(4), 351(3) and 238(b) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, hereinafter being referred as “BNS” only, the FIR No. 40 dated 22.03.2025 has been lodged in Police Station Behal, District Bhiwani, Haryana. This is first petition for bail, filed by the petitioner, under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, hereinafter being referred to as “BNSS” only.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the above mentioned FIR came into being at the instance of Ravinder Kumar alias Guddu, hereinafter referred to as “complainant” only. It was stated by the

above named complainant that he was a brick kiln owner and a property

dealer and that on 06.03.2025 at about 03.06 P.M. he had received WhatsApp calls from a foreign mobile number but he did not answer. According to complainant thereafter on 15.03.2025 at about 01.24 P.M. he received a voice message on WhatsApp from foreign number and the contents of WhatsApp message were:- *“Sarpanch Sahab, I am Rohit Godara and I am speaking from the Lawrence Bishnoi Group. Call back”*.

3. The above named complainant further stated that he did not respond to the above mentioned call and thereafter, he received another voice message on his WhatsApp from foreign number wherein the sender introduced himself as Rohit Godara of Lawrence Bishnoi Gang and demanded ₹2,00,00,000/- as ransom. As per complainant, the sender of the message had threatened him of dire consequences in case of non-payment of ransom money. It was further stated by the above named complainant that earlier he was trying to verify the contents of threat at his own level and that he had enmity with Devender Soni and Laxman Goswami who were having a land dispute with Kedar Seth and that the complainant had helped Kedar Seth in the above mentioned issue.

4. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of the above mentioned information, the formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner is innocent having no nexus, whatsoever, with the commission of crime, and that merely on the basis of suspicion raised by the complainant, who himself had admitted that he was having enmity with the petitioner, the petitioner

has been lodged in jail. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, there is no iota of evidence showing any link between the alleged threat received by the complainant and the petitioner.

7. In addition to above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has also argued that otherwise also the petitioner has already suffered sentence for a period of more than nine months, and that the trial is progressing at a snail pace. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the offence is triable by the court of Judicial Magistrate, and that the investigation in this case is already over and therefore, the detention of petitioner in the judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose. In view of above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has claimed that the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.

8. The learned State counsel has controverted the above mentioned arguments. It has been contended by the learned State counsel that in the present case there are very specific and categorical allegations with regard to involvement of petitioner in the commission of crime, and that the menace of extortion from well-to-do businessmen of the society is prevalent in the area where the FIR in question has been lodged. According to learned State counsel, Lawrence Bishnoi Gang is very active in District Bhiwani, Haryana and the adjoining area. As per learned State counsel the link of petitioner with with the above said gang, with regard to commission of instant offence, stands established from the fact that the petitioner was in contact with the members of Lawrence Bishnoi Gang who are confined in jail.

9. The learned State counsel has further contended that the

frequent conversation between the petitioner and the members of Lawrence Bishnoi Gang makes it apparently clear that the suspicion raised by the complainant was not unfounded. According to learned State counsel otherwise also the total custody period of the petitioner is not even one year and therefore, on the ground of delay in trial also, he is not entitled for the benefit of bail.

10. The record has been perused carefully.

11. As far as the instant case is concerned, at the very outset, it is pertinent to mention here that the offence of extortion of money is an offence of serious nature in a developing society, as the budding businessmen, professionals & well-to-do members of the society are targeted by the criminal elements and they are subjected to extreme mental harassment and financial loss for ransom. Thus, merely on the ground that the offence is triable by the court of Judicial Magistrate, the gravity of above mentioned offence cannot be and should not be ignored.

12. The instant case is a case, wherein, to link the petitioner with the commission of offence, the prosecution case is not resting only upon the foundation of the disclosure statement. Rather the scientific evidence in the form of call detail records is there and thus, this argument of learned counsel for the petitioner *prima facie* does not hold good that the instant case is a case of no evidence.

13. As a sequel to observations made in the foregoing paragraphs, it is hereby held that the instant petition for bail is devoid of merits and deserves dismissal. Thus, the present petition is hereby **dismissed**, accordingly.

14. It is, however, made clear that any observation made here-in-above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

15. The miscellaneous application(s) pending, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

January 23, 2026
“DK”

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