



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-61579 of 2025

Date of Decision: 25.02.2026

Gurwinder Singh alias Sunny

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

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

Present: Mr. Gobind Singh Randhawa, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab, for the respondent.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. This petition for bail is first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.33 dated 06.07.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s) 308(4), 351(2) and 61(2) of 'the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023' Police Station Mattewal, District Amritsar (Rural), Punjab.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from the record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Ranjit Singh alias Mangu', hereinafter being referred to as "complainant" only. The above-named complainant had stated before the police that he was running a grocery shop in village Udhoke Kalan and that on 06.07.2025 he received a

WhatsApp call on his mobile phone and the caller told him that he was

‘Gurwinder Singh’ brother of ‘Billa Manga’ and calling from jail. As per complainant, the caller demanded a sum of ₹30,00,000/- and threatened that if the demand money was not paid, he (complainant) would be killed. According to complainant, he also came to know that similar demand for ransom had been made from ‘Manoj Kumar’ son of Banarsi Dass, a cloth merchant. It was also stated by the complainant that on enquiry at his own level he came to know that ‘Gurwiinder Singh, who was confined in jail, along with his brother ‘Jobanjit Singh alias Billa Arjun Manga’ and other family members was involved in the activities of collecting ransom by threatening businessmen. It is the case of the prosecution that on receipt of above-mentioned complaint, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

3. Heard.

4. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner is innocent who has been falsely implicated in the present case, and that the story set-out by the prosecution is improbable as at the time of alleged call the petitioner was lodged in prison. The learned counsel for the petitioner has also contended that otherwise also the offence is triable by the court of Judicial Magistrate, and that the petitioner has already suffered a prolonged incarceration for being in custody for a period of more than seven months. On the above-mentioned grounds, the benefit of bail has been sought by the petitioner.

5. The learned State counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel, the petitioner is a person who is infamous for his involvement for running a big group

involved in the collection of ransom, and that the petitioner has a chequered history of criminal activities. While referring to the contents of custody certificate, the learned State counsel has contended that in addition to present case, the petitioner is facing trial in nine other cases, and that most of the above-mentioned cases pertain to serious offences.

6. The learned State counsel has also contended that the total custody period of petitioner is not large enough to draw an inference that he is facing prolonged incarceration. It has also been contended by the learned State counsel that in the present case the material witnesses are yet to be examined and if the petitioner is released on bail it will adversely impact the morale of the witnesses who are already afraid of the petitioner.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. A careful perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are necessary to be taken into consideration for a decision:-

- i) that allegations against the petitioner are very specific and categorical qua the fact that under threat he demanded ransom.
- ii) that there are allegations that the petitioner is involved in the activities of demanding ransom with the help of his family members and others;
- ii) that the petitioner has a chequered history of criminal activities as he is facing prosecution in nine other cases; and
- iii) that the total custody period of the petitioner is not large

enough to draw an inference that his prolonged incarceration is resulting into breach of his right of speedy trial.

8. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of above-mentioned factors, coupled with the gravity of offence, it is hereby held that at this stage, the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail and the present petition being devoid of merits deserves dismissal. Hence, the present petition is hereby **dismissed**, accordingly.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

February 25, 2026
“DK”

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