



CRM-M-62709-2025 and
CRM-M-67255-2025

1

205 (2 cases)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-62709-2025

Rohit

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CRM-M-67255-2025

Anmol @ Maula

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

Decided on: 30.01.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. A.S. Manaise, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-62709-2025)

Mr. Vidit Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-67255-2025).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh Gill, Addl. A.G., Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. By way of this common order, both the above-mentioned petitions are being decided together as they arise out of the same FIR and common allegations.
2. CRM-M-62709-2025 arises out of **FIR No. 67 dated 09.12.2024**, registered at Police Station Tibber, District Gurdaspur, under Section 308(5) BNS (Section 61(2) BNS and Sections 21(b), 27(A), 29 of NDPS Act added later on)



**CRM-M-62709-2025 and
CRM-M-67255-2025**

2

and CRM-M-67255-2025 arises out of **FIR No. 67 dated 09.12.2024**, registered at Police Station Tibber, District Gurdaspur, under Section 308(5), 61(2) BNS, Sections 21(B), 27(A), 29/61/85 of NDPS Act.

3. As per allegations in the FIR, complainant-Sandeep Singh Kang, received a call on his mobile No. 6239758350 from the number +601160776300, and the caller disclosed his name as Yaseen Akhtar, and thereupon threatened and then demanded an amount of Rs. 75 lacs as ransom, saying that if the money is not paid, the complainant's entire family including his brother Harmanjeet Singh would be killed. A deadline of only 12 hours was given for the complainant-Sandeep Singh Kang to respond.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that infact petitioner has been involved in a false case, by concocting the allegations. It is submitted that even if the complaint made by the complainant is assumed to be true, none of the petitioners hereinabove have any direct connection to the alleged demand of ransom or even any subsequent recovery. Further more, it is also argued that allegation claiming that petitioner is a member of the Lawrence Bishnoi Group is unsubstantiated, as no such evidence exists. The petitioner-Rohit, is stated to be inside jail for the last more than a period of 01 year, 01 month and 05 days and petitioner- Anmol @ Mola is inside jail for more than a period of 06 months. Thus, prays for grant of bail.

5. Learned State counsel has filed two separate status reports dated 13.01.2026 and 29.01.2026, and the same are taken on record.

6. In the status report, it is explained that upon being informed by the complainant that he was going to hand over ransom amount of Rs. 2 lacs at the



**CRM-M-62709-2025 and
CRM-M-67255-2025**

3

place near Brig Killan, Police Station Tibber, Investigating Officer and other police officials also joined the process and thereupon, accused Rohit Kumar, was arrested alongwith amount of Rs. 2 lacs on 18.12.2024. In status report it has further been explained that from the disclosure statement of the accused-Rohit, four more accused were involved in the case namely Sagar, Anmol @ Mola (petitioner in CRM-M-67255-2025), Sahil and Shelly. Subsequently, 20 grams of Heroin and amount of Rs. 4 lacs were recovered form his car. Accused-Anmol @ Mola (petitioner in CRM-M-67255-2025) was arrested on 19.07.2025, however, nothing was recovered from him.

7. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that both the petitioners actually belong to Lawrence Bishnoi Group and substantial recovery has been effected from the petitioner-Rohit. Since, the process of recording statements, is yet to start, therefore, plea of grant of bail be declined at this stage.

8. I have considered the submissions made by leaned counsel for the parties and gone through the status report.

9. On being asked by the Court, the concerned Investigating Officer ASI Rakesh Kumar submits that no identification mark or its series numbers were noted down on the currency notes of Rs. 2 lacs, which were recovered from the accused-Rohit. It is also noticed that only 20 grams of Heroin is shown to be recovered at the instance of the petitioner, and cash amount of Rs. 4 lacs from the car, belonging to the petitioner-Rohit, the evidentiary value of these items and whether they should be linked to his disclosure statement implicating four other accused is yet to be determined by the learned trial Court. The petitioner–Anmol @ Mola has been nominated as accused solely based on the disclosure statement of



**CRM-M-62709-2025 and
CRM-M-67255-2025**

4

petitioner-Rohit. From the said accused, nothing was recovered. It is also noticed that petitioner-Rohit is involved in one more case, after the instant case when he was arrested on 18.12.2024 i.e. FIR No. 225 was registered against the petitioner on the very next day i.e. 19.12.2025 under Sections 21 and 29 of NDPS Act at Police Station Division 8 Jalandhar.

10. Learned counsel for the petitioner in CRM-M-62709-2025 submits that infact in the said case, in FIR No. 225 dated 19.12.2024, he was involved as accused two days after the registration of that FIR and after being arrested in the instant case on 18.12.2024 i.e. on 21.01.2024. No other cases are shown to be registered against the petitioner-Rohit. As far as second petitioner-Anmol @ Mola is concerned, he was also made accused in FIR No. 126 dated 13.12.2024 under Section 308(5) BNS at Police Station City Nakodar, after being arrested in the instant case as accused.

11. Considering all the aspects into consideration, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioners.

12. Accordingly, both the petitions are allowed. Rohit (petitioner in CRM-M-62709-2025) and Anmol @ Mola (petitioner in CRM-M-67255-2025) 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.

13. Needless to observe that the petitioner(s) shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

14. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be



**CRM-M-62709-2025 and
CRM-M-67255-2025**

construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

- 15. Both the petitions stand disposed of.
- 16. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

30.01.2026
reena

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*