



CRM-M-24363-2025

-1-

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

340

CRM-M-24363-2025

Date of decision: 13th May, 2025

Karanvir Singh @ Karanbeer Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vivek Sharma, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 43 dated 19.03.2025 registered under Sections 308(4), 351(2) and 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Sadar, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. Adumbrated facts as emanating from the record are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Paramjit Singh, who was involved in the business of sale and purchase of combines and tractors and was also the current Sarpanch of Village Jandwala, alleging therein that on 13.02.2025, he had received a video call on his cellphone from an unknown number. Shortly, thereafter, he



received a message demanding an amount of Rs. 25,00,000/- and asking him to act quickly. The complainant deleted the said message and blocked the number presuming that it was a fraudulent call. On the same day, his driver-Swaran Singh received a call from the same number, he did not answer it and blocked it. On 17.03.2025, Swaran Singh received two audio messages on his *whatsapp* whereby threats were extended to the complainant and demand of Rs. 25,00,000/- was raised. His driver informed him about the message. On 19.03.2025, he received a *whatsapp* call from the same number, the caller extended threats to kill him. Apprehending danger to his life, the complainant prayed for taking action. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. On 22.03.2025, the complainant recorded a supplementary statement, on the basis of which, accused Amandeep Singh was nominated as an accused and was arrested. He suffered disclosure statement and took the names of the present petitioner and co-accused Lovepreet Singh. The petitioner was nominated as such and was arrested on 22.03.2025. Investigation is still going on.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused Amandeep Singh. He was not named in the FIR. There is no material to connect him with the allegations. He has clean antecedents. A false recovery of phone has been planted upon him. His further incarceration is not going to serve any useful purpose as investigation and trial are likely to take time. No forensic evidence has been collected to connect him with the crime. The ingredients for commission of subject offences have not been



made out against him. There is no meta data to connect the petitioner with the cellphone from whom ransom calls had been received by the complainant or his driver. Accordingly, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Custody certificate has been filed by respondent-State. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused and by using digital media platform is alleged to have made a ransom call to the complainant by showing use of some other phone number and is also alleged to have made calls/sent messages to the driver of the complainant. He was not named in the FIR and has been involved in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused. Investigation and trial are likely to take time. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. Nothing remains to be recovered from the petitioner as a phone has already been recovered from him. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is well settled proposition of law that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. Keeping in view the discussion as made above but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, I am of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the same is allowed and the

**CRM-M-24363-2025****-4-**

petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

13th May, 2025
Parveen Sharma

<i>1. Whether speaking/ reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes / No</i>
<i>2. Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes / No</i>