

2026:PHHC:037999



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.68170 of 2025

Sandeep Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	10.03.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	12.03.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	12.03.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate,
Mr. Harshdeep Singh, Advocate,
Mr. Varun Singla, Advocate,
Ms. Anita Devi, Advocate and
Ms. Manju, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under
Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short



“BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
95	29.04.2025	City Kotkapura, District Faridkot	308(2) and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”) (25 of Arms Act, 1959 added later on)

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Parampreet Singh @ Soni Dhaliwal alleging that on the evening of 27.04.2025, he received one call from a particular number of his cell phone and the caller introduced himself as Jas Behbal, member of Bambiha group. He disconnected the call. However, he received another call and then a voice message threatening to pick up the phone and otherwise to face consequence. He received five other calls from another number on his phone. Similar calls were received by his cousin brother Harpreet Singh which had not been responded to. Then threatening message through Whatsapp had been sent to him. Ransom money was also demanded from him by making call to his brother. Thereafter, on 29.04.2025 also similar calls were made and threats were extended to kill the complainant. By apprehending danger to his life and safety, the complainant prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The complainant recorded his supplementary statement on 05.05.2025 alleging that infact one Jaspreet Singh @ Jass resident of Village Behbal Kalan in connivance with one Akashdeep Singh lodged in jail had

2026:PHHC:037999



been making threatening calls to his brother and himself. Then on 06.09.2025, the complainant made another statement before the police saying that he had seen CCTV camera installed in his house and two youths one of them whom was Jass Behbal was seen doing recce of his house and thereafter, he had heard sounds of firing of shots. He alleged that the petitioner along with co-accused Ramjot Singh had fired shots outside his house and he had also received demand of extortion of money of Rs.1 crore. The CCTV footage was checked and the present petitioner and co-accused Ramjot Singh were duly identified by the complainant. The petitioner and co-accused were arrested on 07.09.2025. They suffered disclosure statements to the effect that one Malkeet Singh lodged in Faridkot jail had arranged a pistol and 9 cartridges for them for firing outside the house of the complainant and they had fired shots as per the instructions of accused Jas Behbal with whom they were in contact with Honor tablet. The petitioner got recovered one tablet make Honor. On 12.09.2025, as further alleged, the accused Ramjot Singh had suffered disclosure statement to get a pistol recovered but when he was taken towards the informed place, under the pretext of getting the weapon recovered, he had fired two shots towards the police party by picking up the firearm from the hidden spot and made an attempt to kill them. In defence, the gun shot was fired upon the co-accused by Inspector Chamkaur Singh. Investigation now stands concluded.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. A false recovery has been planted upon

2026:PHHC:037999



him. He was not named in the FIR and has been implicated after a period of more than four months thereafter. He is on bail in another case registered against him. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Per contra, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner who being a member of Bambiha group and in conspiracy with the other accused, had gone outside the house of the complainant as on 01.09.2025 and had fired shots with pistol outside the house of the complainant with an intent to overawe him and to extort money from him. His complicity in the crime sufficiently stands established. His antecedents are not clean. There are chances of his absconding, intimidating the witnesses or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have fired shots with pistol outside the house of the complainant as on 01.09.2025 with intent to extend threats to him, overawe him and to extort money from him. He had been seen in the CCTV footage of the camera installed in the house of the complainant and had been duly identified by him. The allegations against him are serious in nature. Such like crimes are on rise. The trial has commenced and there is nothing on record at this stage to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the same. Taking into consideration the above discussed



facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that no case for release of the petitioner at this stage is made out. Accordingly, finding no compelling ground to allow the petition, the same is dismissed.

8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

12.03.2026	(MANISHA BATRA)
manju	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No