



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

125

CRM-M-72644-2025
Decided on : 09.03.2026

Sukhdeep Singh @ Sukh . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. J.S. Ghumman, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Sukhdeep Singh @ Sukh	179	20.10.2025	308(5) & 351(3) of BNS, 2023	Sadar Nakodar	Jalandhar Rural

2. A few facts necessary for adjudication of the case, as noticed in the order dated 16.12.2025 passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, whereby the bail application filed by the petitioner was dismissed, may be reproduced as under:-

“ In brief the facts of the prosecution case are that FIR was registered on the basis of statement made by Gurwinder Singh @ Binder son of Kehar Singh. It was submitted that he is running a Finance Company by the name of Inder Finance Company and his offices are situated at Kapurthala and Mithapur, Jalandhar. He has two sons, elder son is Amrinder Singh aged about 11 years and younger son Yorawar Singh



aged about 4 years and beside them his wife Ranjit Kaur @ Deep, his father Kehar Singh and mother Surinder Kaur are also residing with him. On 16.10.2025, as per routine, he has gone to his office at Jalandhar. At about 8:16 p.m, he was present in his office, he received one call on his mobile phone No.9855623732 on Whatsapp from phone No. +4374214019, who threatened him and the caller disclosed his name as Goldy Dhillon from Canada. Said person told him that he is member of Bishnoi Gang and asked him to make arrangement of Rs.1 Crore within 15 days and threatened that in case amount is not given, he should be ready for facing adverse consequences. On 19.10.2025 at about 12:30 p.m, he was present at his home and then he received calls from another Whatsapp No.+4372869987, which he did not attend and then he received another call on his another phone No.6284530509 and he attended the same and the caller disclosed his name as Goldy Dhillon. Said caller told that in case he has any suspicion then he can verify. Thereafter, he received many calls, but he did not attend the same and threatening messages were also received and he also recorded voice wherein caller told that in case amount is not given then be ready to face bullets. The caller told that he know about his son, who is studying in Cambridge School, Nakodar and demanded money again. On 20.10.2025 at 10:49 a.m, one threatening audio was sent wherein it was told that they know that his office is at Mithapur, Jalandhar and is having many cars and it was mentioned in recording that even to give information about recording to the police. Earlier he had not given intimation to the police, as he was threatened and now he has got recorded his statement. Action be taken.

Thereafter, supplementary statement of Gurwinder Singh was recorded stating that he is doing Finance business and his offices are situated at Kapurthala and Mithapur, Jalandhar. On 20.10.2025, he alongwith his father Kehar Singh come to the Police Post to get his statement recorded and want to get FIR registered. He wants to disclose that the son of uncle(Taya) of his wife namely Jinder is known to one Sukhdeep Singh @ Sukh son of Sucha Singh, R/o Bhandal Dona, Police Station Sadar, Kapurthala and therefore, he also knew him. The said Sukhdeep Singh @ Sukh had deposited a sum of Rs.7 lacs in his Finance Company on 10.10.2025. Thereafter, from 16.10.2025 to 22.10.2025, he started receiving threatening calls demanding Rs.1 crore from him. He had told Sukhdeep Singh @ Sukh regarding the said threatening calls and Sukhdeep Singh @ Sukh came to his office on 23.10.2025 at Kapurthala and told him that police cannot do anything with regard to the calls vide which demand of Rs.1 Crore has been made and told that he would get the



matter settled with the person who is demanding money. When he showed threatening voice message to Sukhdeep Singh @ Sukh, then he recognized the voice and said that it is the voice of Manveer Singh Padda and he know him and he is living in Canada and he has full belief from the talks of Sukhdeep Singh @ Sukh that Sukhdeep Singh @ Sukh son of Sucha Singh, R/o Vill.Bhandal Dona, Police Station Sadar, Kapurthala and Manveer Singh Padda son of Karamjit Singh, R/o Bhikhariwal, Batala, Distt.Gurdaspur now resident of Canada have connived with each other for demanding Rs.1 Crore extortion and threatened him that in case payment is not made, his life and that of his family would be harmed. Action be taken.”

3. During the course of hearing, it came to the fore that in fact there was some monetary issue between the complainant – Gurwinder Singh @ Binder and co-accused – Manveer Singh Padda.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the threatening calls were allegedly received by the complainant from a person identifying himself as “Goldy Dhillon” from Canada. However, merely on the basis of suspicion, the petitioner has also been implicated in the present case, despite there being no material on record to substantiate the allegation of his involvement.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 26.10.2025, i.e., for a period of more than three months. It is further contended that the alleged offences are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate and, therefore, the petitioner cannot be kept behind bars for an indefinite period. The petitioner is stated to be 32 years of age and is not involved in any other criminal case of similar nature. Thus, his alleged involvement in the present case is a matter to be determined during the course of trial. Accordingly, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.



5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the allegations in the present case pertain to threats of extortion involving a demand of Rs.1.00 crore. It is contended that the petitioner was known to the complainant and had visited his office, where he allegedly assured that he would get the matter settled with the person who was making the threatening calls. According to the prosecution, such conduct *prima facie* indicates the petitioner's nexus with the co-accused – Manveer Singh Padda, who is alleged to have made the threatening calls from abroad.

Learned State counsel further submits that considering the nature of the allegations and the gravity of the offence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail at this stage. However, he fairly concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 26.10.2025 and is not shown to be involved in any other criminal case.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

7. At this stage, it is noticeable that the alleged threatening calls were received by the complainant from a person identifying himself as “Goldy Dhillon” from Canada and the principal allegations appear to be directed against the co-accused – Manveer Singh Padda. The implication of the present petitioner appears to be primarily on the basis of suspicion arising out of his acquaintance with the complainant and the co-accused.

It is also not disputed that the petitioner is in custody since 26.10.2025 and the alleged offences are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate. The trial is yet to commence and its conclusion is likely to take considerable time. In such circumstances, continued incarceration of the petitioner for an indefinite period would not serve any useful purpose.



8. Considering the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, including the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner; the nature of allegations; the fact that the case is triable by the Court of learned Magistrate; and also without commenting anything on the merits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his 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.

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

10. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 09, 2026

J.Ram

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