



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

217

**CRM-5461-2025 in/and  
CRA-D-227-2025  
Date of Decision: 08.10.2025**

GURPREET SINGH @ JASS

.....APPELLANT

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL  
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE LAPITA BANERJI**

Present:- Mr. Navraj S. Mahal, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Adeshwar Singh Pannu, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>FIR No.</b>	<b>Dated</b>	<b>Police Station</b>	<b>Section/s</b>
125	14.10.2023	Bhogpur, District Jalandhar	386 IPC and Sections 17, 18, 18-B, 20 of UAPA were added later on

**GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)**

**CRM-5471-2025**

Prayer in the present application is for condonation of delay of 2 days in filing the appeal.

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed. The delay of 2 days in filing the instant appeal is hereby condoned.

2025:PHHC:139402-DB



**CRM-5461-2025 in/and  
CRA-D-227-2025**

-2-

**CRA-D-227-2025**

1. The appellant assails the order dated 03.01.2025, vide which his application for grant of bail has been declined by the trial Court.
2. In nutshell, the FIR in the instant case was lodged at the instance of Palwinder Kumar Bhandari, wherein he alleged that on 13.10.2023 at about 8:43 AM when he was present in his house, he received a whatsapp call on his mobile No.9814440861 made from an international Phone No. +120090779710 and the caller while identifying himself as Lakhvir Singh @ Ladda Hareke, demanded an amount of Rs.2 crores while issuing a threat that in case, the said amount is not paid, he would be eliminated. It is the case of the prosecution that the appellant who came to be arrested on 23.10.2023 i.e. after about 10 days of the occurrence, in connection with some other case, suffered a disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the present case.
3. Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the appellant is nowhere named in the FIR and has been nominated falsely in the instant case on the basis of his own disclosure statement and the disclosure statement made by the co-accused, whereas there is nothing on record to show his involvement in the instant case. It has been submitted that the telephone call allegedly received by the complainant, could not be connected with the appellant in any manner and the prosecution relies mainly on the disclosure



statement made by the appellant himself and also allegedly made by some other co-accused, which would be inadmissible in evidence.

4. Opposing the appeal, learned State counsel submitted that the appellant is part of a larger gang based abroad and had conspired to extort money from the complainant and since he had virtually admitted the offence and even the co-accused had made an identical disclosure statement, his complicity is clearly evident. Learned State counsel has also referred to the custody certificate which shows that the appellant is involved in some other cases as well.

5. We have considered the rival submissions addressed before this Court.

6. It is not in dispute that the appellant is not named in the FIR and he sought to be nominated on the basis of his own disclosure statement and also on the basis of disclosure statement made by the co-accused. The admissibility of such like disclosure statements would be debatable. There is nothing on record to show that it is the appellant who had made the call. Although, the appellant is stated to be involved in other cases, but some of these cases were either lodged after the instant FIR or are such where appellant came to be nominated later on the basis of disclosure statements. The appellant in any case is behind the bars since last 01 year, 10 months and 29 days. The trial is still at the initial stage.

2025:PHHC:139402-DB



**CRM-5461-2025 in/and  
CRA-D-227-2025**

**-4-**

7. Having regard to the aforesaid position particularly the fact that there is no direct evidence establishing the involvement of the appellant, the impugned order dated 03.01.2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar is set aside. The appeal, as such, is accepted and the appellant is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is however, clarified that none of the observations made above shall be taken to be an expression on merits of the main case.

**[GURVINDER SINGH GILL]  
JUDGE**

**[LAPITA BANERJI]  
JUDGE**

**08.10.2025**

*Prince*

*Whether speaking/reasoned:*

*Yes/No*

*Whether reportable:*

*Yes/No*