



CRM-M NO.60644-2024 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

(207) CRM-M NO.60644-2024
DATE OF DECISION: 19.09.2025

Amritpal Singh @ AmritPetitioner

VERSUS

State of PunjabRespondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present Mr.Pardhuman Garg, Advocate
for Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr.Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab
with ASI Harbhal Singh.
Mr. Swapan Sharma, Commissioner of Police,
Ludhiana in person.

H.S.GREWAL, J (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed for grant of regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.43 dated 18.04.2024 under Sections 384, 386, 506, 120-B, 177, 255 and 419 of IPC 1860 and 25,54,59 of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Sarabha Nagar, Ludhiana.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and his co-accused had made ransom calls to the complainant and also sent photographs of his wife while she was shopping, in order to extort money from the complainant. The role of the petitioner is that he was the driver of the vehicle which was involved in *reki* of the wife of the complainant and the said vehicle has been recovered. Additionally, a phone call was made to the co-accused, Ramandeep, in the Philippines, who had been making ransom calls to the complainant." It is also mentioned therein that eight pistols were recovered from co-accused namely Tejender Pal Singh.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an innocent person and has falsely been implicated in the present case. There



CRM-M NO.60644-2024 2

is delay in lodging the FIR, which seems to be an afterthought. Learned counsel further submits that nothing is to be recovered from the present petitioner, who is in custody since the date of his arrest.

4. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, same is taken on record. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that keeping in view the seriousness of the crime, the petitioner does not deserve any leniency and the petition for grant of regular bail may be dismissed.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. Keeping in view the seriousness of the crime, gravity and magnitude of the offence, this Court is of the considered opinion that the present petitioner is deeply involved in this crime for which he is charged for on 18.08.2025 and if petitioner is released on regular bail, who is in custody for the last one year, four months and twenty one days only, he may try to win over the prosecution witnesses and there is every likelihood of his hampering the investigation and tampering with the evidence.

7. No ground is made out for grant of regular bail at this stage.

8. Dismissed.

19.09.2025
mamta

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No