



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-37299-2025

Reserved on: 28th August, 2025

Pronounced on: 4th September, 2025

Rajwinder Singh @ Rajwinder Singh Sekhon

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. R.S. Thind, Advocate,
Mr. Bhrigu Agnihotri, Advocate and
Mr. Jagdeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 105 dated 10.06.2025 registered under Sections 308(2), 127(2), 115(2) and 190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Cantt Bathinda, Punjab.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Gural Singh alleging that he was engaged in the business of online sale of air tickets. The petitioner-Rajwinder Singh was also involved in the same business. In the morning of 07.06.2025, he received a call from the petitioner to come to meet him in



connection with purchase of some air tickets. On his asking, the complainant had gone to Bathinda, wherein the petitioner who was present in an i20 car along with the co-accused Tonny and Ravinder made him sit in that car. He was wrongfully confined in that car. The bag kept by him containing the licensed revolver, 11 live cartridges and cash amount of Rs. 15,000/- and licence, ATM cards etc. had been opened by the petitioner and the co-accused Ravinder Kumar, demand of a sum of Rs. 3,70,000/- was raised by the accused Tonny and his cell phone and gold bracelet were removed by them. Thereafter, he was taken to some factory and was assaulted by the petitioner and the co-accused. Thereafter, they took him to some chamber of a lawyer unknown to the complainant at Sub-division Sherpur, District Barnala, wherein he was forced to sign some stamp papers. The accused-Ravinder Kumar by using google-pay account from his mobile phone withdraw an amount of Rs.40,000/-. It was only thereafter that his mobile phone, ATM card, revolver etc. were returned and he was left at village Handia. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bill, which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda vide order dated 09.07.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He has clean antecedents. He deals in business of online sale of air tickets at Barnala. He had contacted the complainant for purchase of air tickets and had paid an amount of Rs. 2,00,000/- to the complainant, who did not issue tickets nor return his



money. No specific role has been attributed to him. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that, keeping in view the grave nature of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of pre-arrest bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and has gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner, along with the co-accused, is alleged to have wrongfully confined the complainant, extorted money from him after assaulting him, and also took away his bracelet, live cartridges, and caused injuries to him. The allegations against him are specific and serious in nature. For conducting thorough and proper investigation in the matter, his custodial interrogation is required. The case is at nascent stage. It is also well settled that the Court must be circumspect while exercising such power for grant of anticipatory bail and it should not be granted as a matter of rule and has to be granted only when the Court is convinced that exceptional circumstances exist to resort to that extra ordinary remedy. In the present case, no such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.



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

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

4th September, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned

: Yes / No

2. Whether reportable

: Yes / No