



CRM-M-60671 of 2025

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

229

CRM-M-60671 of 2025
Date of Decision: 30.01.2026

Inderjeet Singh @ Inder

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Rohit Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amritpal Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.96 dated 08.07.2025 registered under Sections 308(2) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act were added later on), at Police Station Kalanaur, District Gurdaspur.

2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner provided the complainant's mobile number to another person who thereafter made ransom and threatening calls to the complainant from an international number.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with

**CRM-M-60671 of 2025****-2-**

the said offence. He argued that as per prosecution, the alleged extortion was received by the complainant on 04.07.2025 and the FIR in question was registered on 08.07.2025 i.e. after an unexplained delay of 04 days, casting serious doubt on the prosecution story. He further argued that there is no concrete evidence showing that the petitioner has given the number of complainant to some other person for extortion calls. He further submits that the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. The petitioner is in custody since 08.07.2025 and nothing is to be recovered from him. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have also been framed. He further submits that there are total 09 prosecution witnesses in the case but none has been examined till date and as such, the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has already filed the status report in the matter and while referring to the same, has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. He argued that the petitioner is the main accused in this case who forwarded the mobile number of the complainant to some other person for the purpose of making ransom calls. However, he has not controverted the fact that the petitioner is first time offender as he is not involved in any other case.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 06 months; he has clean antecedents; investigation is



CRM-M-60671 of 2025

-3-

complete; challan stands presented; charges framed; out of 09 witnesses, none has been examined till date; the complicity of the petitioner is a matter of trial, and will take a long time to conclude. Thus, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. His continued detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

6. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of her right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle "*bail is a rule*" and "*jail is an exception*".

7. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

30.01.2026
D.Bansal

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