



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

(117)

CRM-M-50354-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: **07.09.2026**

GURLAL SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

-.-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. Harpreet S. Rakhra, Advocate and
Mr. Gurvinder Kaur Jaura, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasjit Singh Rattu, DAG, Punjab.

-.-

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The present is the first petition under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (corresponding to Section 438 Cr.P.C.), seeking the extraordinary discretionary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.148 dated 03.06.2026, registered under Sections 308(4), 305(5), 308(7), 127(2), 351(2), 351(3) and 61(2) of the BNS, corresponding to Sections 387, 380, 383 to 389, 363, 506, 504 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.

2. The brief facts of the case, as emerging from the FIR, are that the complainant, Harjinder Singh, an Assistant Lineman with Punjab State Power Corporation Limited, was allegedly contacted on 27.05.2026 by Rajwinder Kaur, who represented that her daughter was seriously ill and required blood. She met the complainant near Sri Darbar Sahib, Tarn



Taran, and allegedly took him to her residence on his motorcycle on the pretext of introducing him to her daughter. Upon reaching the house, she allegedly took him into a room, where three unidentified youths entered, forcibly took his mobile phone and purse, threatened him with a sickle and allegedly took objectionable photographs of him and Rajwinder Kaur.

2.1. The complainant alleged that the said persons thereafter threatened to implicate him in a rape case and circulate the photographs on social media unless he paid ₹1 lakh. Under fear and coercion, he allegedly transferred various amounts through Google Pay, obtained further funds from his acquaintances and also availed a credit-card loan, ultimately paying an aggregate amount of approximately ₹72,400/-. The accused allegedly retained the original registration certificate and documents of his motorcycle and demanded a further ₹30,000/- for their return. On 28.05.2026, upon receiving another threatening call demanding the balance amount, the complainant narrated the incident to his friend Upkar Singh and thereafter approached the police. During their own inquiry, they allegedly identified Rajwinder Kaur alias Rajji, Gurlal Singh, Pratap Singh Bath and Sahil Arora as the persons involved in the alleged extortion and confinement. The FIR was consequently registered and investigation commenced.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and no specific overt act is attributed to him therein. It is contended that the principal allegations are directed against Rajwinder Kaur, whereas the petitioner is subsequently alleged to be one of the persons who entered the room where the complainant and Rajwinder Kaur



were present. The petitioner is stated to have threatened the complainant with a datar; however, the specific allegations regarding snatching of the mobile phone and purse and taking of the objectionable photographs have been attributed to the other members of the group. It is further submitted that no amount is alleged to have been received in the petitioner's account. Learned counsel accordingly prays for grant of the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Upon advance notice, Mr. Jasjit Singh Rattu, DAG, accepts notice on behalf of the State of Punjab and vehemently opposes the prayer for pre-arrest bail. Learned State counsel submits that, having regard to the nature, gravity and seriousness of the allegations and the manner in which the offence is alleged to have been perpetrated, the petitioner does not deserve the extraordinary discretionary protection of anticipatory bail at this stage. Dismissal of the present petition is accordingly prayed for.

6. Having considered the rival submissions and upon perusal of the record, this Court finds that the allegations against the petitioner are of a serious nature. The prosecution case *prima facie* projects the petitioner as a member of a group allegedly engaged in an organised extortion racket, whereby the complainant was lured into a room, induced to disrobe and thereafter photographed in a compromising and objectionable position. The petitioner is specifically alleged to have entered the room along with the co-accused, participated in the intimidation of the complainant while armed with a datar, and threatened him with death unless an amount of ₹1 lakh was paid, coupled with the threat of falsely



implicating him in a rape case and circulating the objectionable photographs on social media. The prosecution further alleges that, pursuant to such coercion, an aggregate amount of ₹72,400/- was transferred, including amounts arranged through the accounts of the complainant's friend Gurbax Singh and cousin Sukhpal Singh.

6.1. The mere fact that the petitioner was not named in the initial FIR cannot, in the peculiar factual matrix of the present case, by itself constitute a ground for extending the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail, particularly when the complainant had allegedly been confronted by multiple persons during the occurrence and could not reasonably have been expected to know their individual identities at that stage. The subsequent identification of the petitioner and the specific role attributed to him require effective investigation.

6.2. The allegations also necessitate custodial interrogation for the purpose of unraveling the complete *modus operandi* of the alleged racket, identifying the other persons involved, tracing the flow and destination of the extorted amount, ascertaining the source and whereabouts of the objectionable photographs and determining the respective roles of the petitioner and his co-accused. Grant of pre-arrest protection at this stage may impede such investigation and frustrate the endeavour of the investigating agency to unearth the larger conspiracy, if any.

6.3. Having regard to the nature and gravity of the allegations, the specific role attributed to the petitioner, the alleged extortion of a substantial amount through threats and compromising photographs, and the necessity of custodial interrogation for an effective investigation, this



Court is not persuaded to exercise its extraordinary jurisdiction in favour of the petitioner.

6.4. Accordingly, the present petition is **dismissed**. The observations made herein are confined to the adjudication of the present petition and shall not prejudice the petitioner or either side during investigation or trial.

7. Consequent upon the final adjudication of the principal matter, all pending miscellaneous, interlocutory and consequential applications, if any, stand disposed of accordingly. In view of the final determination of the substantive proceedings, the reliefs sought in such ancillary applications have been rendered infructuous, and no separate or further orders are warranted.

07.09.2026
Gaurav Sorot

(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned / speaking?	Yes / No
Whether reportable?	Yes / No