



226

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

CRM-M-16398-2025

Date of Decision:-08.04.2025

JARMANDEEP SINGH @ ARMAN MANA

... PETITIONER

Versus**STATE OF PUNJAB**

... RESPONDENT

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Ranjodh Singh Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG, Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J (ORAL)

Learned State counsel has filed reply by way of affidavit dated 07.04.2025 of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran, the same is taken on record, copy thereof, has been supplied to the counsel opposite

2. By way of the present petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 (BNSS), the petitioner is praying for anticipatory bail in the following FIR (Annexure P-1) as under:-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
255	05.11.2024	308(2), 351, 125 of the BNS, and 25, 27 of Arms Act	City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran

3. Arguments heard.



4. It is, *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He contends that petitioner has no concern with the allegations levelled in the FIR nor he was named there in but falsely implicated on the alleged disclosure statement of co-accused Tejbir Singh with whom the petitioner has no concern. Hence, prayed for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel referring to the reply submitted by the State has assailed these arguments and opposed the bail petition on the ground that petitioner is alleged to have participated in the crime along with co-accused, wherein they had given extortion calls to the innocent persons and later used to open fire at their premises with a view to terrorize them in order to pressurize the victims to meet their illegal demands. He contends that one more similar nature case is registered against the petitioner, hence custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the *modus operandi*, hence prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.

6. After considering the arguments and perusing the record, it is observed that the instant FIR was registered on the statement of complainant stating that on 04.11.2024 at about 11:00 PM he had received an extortion call from unknown number demanding ₹50 lakhs and also being threatened of dire consequences if he did not paid the amount and the complainant switched off his phone and on it again at 06:00 am, he found a missed call at 04:04am. When the complainant was to leave his house for morning walk



and was climbing down stairs, then two motorcycle borne youngsters with muffled faces came outside his house and the pillion rider open fire towards gate of the house. The matter was reported to the police and FIR was registered. Consequently, co-accused Tejbir Singh was arrested who nominated the present petitioner as his participant in the alleged occurrence. A perusal of disclosure statement would reveal that specific attribution is there against the petitioner of having actively participated in the crime in extending the extortion calls to innocent persons demanding hefty amounts and also threatening of dire consequences in case amount is not paid. There had been firing on the residence of the complainant by the unknown persons immediately after having received such extortion calls. The petitioner has been named by the co-accused as his active participant in the crime, as such, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the *modus operandi*. Therefore, considering the serious nature and gravity of offence, it is observed that no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

7. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

08.04.2025

Gyan

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No