



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

223

**CRM-M-18113-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 07.05.2025**

AMRIK SINGH

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Ankit Rana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, DAG Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

1. Mr. Naresh Chhokar, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant to assist the learned State counsel and filed his power of attorney, which is taken on record.

2. By way of present petition filed under Section 482 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR (Annexure P-1) as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
10	01.03.2025	140(3) BNS; [190, 127, 191(3) BNS added later on]	Rawalpindi, District Kapurthala

3. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. He



contends that the petitioner has no concern whatsoever with the allegations levelled in the FIR. He further contends that the petitioner has been nominated on the basis of alleged disclosure statement of co-accused Raj Kumar. He submits that the petitioner is ready to join investigation and has prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while referring to the status report submitted by State has opposed the petition on the ground that the petitioner accompanied the accused persons at the time of abduction of Kaamal along with his car and demanded ransom amount of ₹50,000/-. Hence, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unravel the truth and prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.

5. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that on 01.03.2025, the complainant suffered a statement that he had received a WhatsApp call on 27.02.2025 of some unknown person, who told him that his brother has been abducted along with his car and in order to get him released a ransom amount of ₹50,000/- has to be paid. During the course of investigation, co-accused Ravi Kumar, Palwinder Singh, Raj Kumar, Sehjad and Jeevan Kumar were arrested. The name of the petitioner surfaced in the disclosure statement of co-accused Raj Kumar, wherein he specifically stated that the petitioner Amarjjit Singh @ Amrik Singh had accompanied them at the time when they abducted Kaamal along with his car and demanded the ransom money.

6. Therefore, considering the active involvement of the petitioner and gravity of offence, it is observed that the petitioner does not deserve any



leniency, moreover, no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, as a consequence, the petition 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

07.05.2025

S.Sharma(syr)

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