



CRM-M-71831-2025 and
CRM-M-2091-2026

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

314 CRM-M-71831-2025

Sukhwinder @ Bunty . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)
314-2 CRM-M-2091-2026

Vishal . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

Decided on :17.02.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

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

Mr. Amish Sharma, Asst. A.G., Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. By way of this common order, the aforementioned petitions are being disposed of together as they arise out of one common FIR.
2. Present petitions have been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS seeking the grant of regular bail in case FIR No.89 dated 11.04.2025, under Sections 308(2), 308(4), 351(2) of BNS and (Sections 111(4) of BNS and Sections 25(1)B(a), 27(2) of Arms Act were added later on), registered at Police Station Civil Line, Kaithal, District Kaithal.
3. As per allegations, in the impugned FIR No. 89 dated 11.04.2025, complainant-Pankaj Gupta had been receiving threatening calls demanding ransom of Rs. 50 lacs on his WhatsApp number. The complainant used to receive the calls from mobile No. 44750- 846- 7088,



**CRM-M-71831-2025 and
CRM-M-2091-2026**

2

in which caller demanded Rs. 50 lacs from the complainant and also told his name as Rohit Rana, one more name was taken by the caller i.e. of Tony Rana. He further alleged that on 29.03.2025, one more call was received from Mobile No. 44750 8467086 on the complainant's son Vansh Gupta's mobile No. 89508- 94000.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the role attributed to petitioner-Sukhwinder @ Bunty has been exaggerated and is based primarily on disclosure statements of co-accused, which carry limited evidentiary value. Counsel further submits that no specific overt act has been attributed to him with respect to the alleged ransom demand or any act of violence. He was neither apprehended at the spot nor was any weapon or incriminating article recovered from his possession. Mere telephonic contact or alleged association with co-accused persons cannot, by itself, establish conscious participation in any criminal conspiracy.

5. With regard to petitioner-Vishal, learned counsel submits that his alleged involvement is also confined to statements of co-accused. There is no material on record to show that he directly participated in making ransom calls, handled any firearm, or derived any monetary benefit from the alleged offence. His implication is stated to be based on suspicion arising out of acquaintance with other accused persons, which, in itself, is insufficient to deny the concession of regular bail.

6. Learned counsel further argues that the instant case was registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Kaithal,



**CRM-M-71831-2025 and
CRM-M-2091-2026**

3

whereas earlier on the same day, petitioner was allegedly involved in FIR No. 222 (supra). As per the allegations in FIR No. 222, petitioners, along with other accused, allegedly fired at a police team, and in the retaliatory firing by the police, co-accused Sonu alias Sonu Ram was hit. Petitioners were arrested in connection with FIR No. 222 at the first instance, and it is submitted that they were thereafter falsely implicated in the present FIR No. 89 (supra).

7. It is an admitted position that petitioner-Sukhwinder @ Bunty and petitioner-Vishal were involved, along with one Sonu, at first instance in FIR No. 222 dated 11.04.2025, registered under Section 25 of the Arms Act and Sections 109(1), 121(1), 132, and 221 of the BNS at Police Station Shahbad, District Kurukshetra. Petitioners herein were released on bail in case FIR No. 222 by the learned Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra, vide order dated 07.08.2025, and the co-accused Sonu was also released on bail by this Court vide order dated 26.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-28759-2025.

8. Learned counsel further points out that both FIRs pertain to different districts and separate incidents. Learned counsel for the petitioners also submits that petitioners have already been in judicial custody for a period of more than six months and co-accused namely Sonu alias Sonu Ram has already been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide order dated 01.12.2025(P-2) passed in CRM-M-56803-2025, thus, prays for grant of regular bail.



**CRM-M-71831-2025 and
CRM-M-2091-2026**

4

9. On the other hand, learned State counsel does not dispute the fact that petitioners were firstly arrested in FIR No. 222 dated 11.04.2025 (supra) and thereupon they were implicated in the present FIR. He also clarified that in the instant case, nothing was recovered from the possession of the petitioners.

10. I have considered the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and gone through the petition and also the fact disclosed by learned State counsel that petitioners are involved in other cases.

11. Undoubtedly, there remains no dispute that petitioners firstly were arrested in FIR No. 222 dated 11.04.2025, which was registered in District Kurukshetra and subsequently were implicated as accused in the present FIR No. 89 dated 11.04.2025 registered in District Kaithal and it would be heavily upon the prosecution to prove the charges of demanding ransom from the complaint-Pankaj Gupta or his son Vansh Gutpa.

Without there being any substantial reasons, petitioners cannot be detained inside jail for an indefinite period. Petitioners herein were released on bail in case FIR No. 222 by the learned Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra, vide order dated 07.08.2025.

Accordingly, prayer made in the present petitions are allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/



**CRM-M-71831-2025 and
CRM-M-2091-2026**

5

Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned,
if not required in any other case.

12. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

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

14. Petitions stand disposed of.

15. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of another connected case.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

17.02.2026

Rashmi

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