

**In the Court of Rashmi Kapila,
Additional Sessions Judge, Kapurthala.
(UID No.PB00201)**

CNR No. PBKP010025292026**Case No. BA/1100/2026****Presented on : 11-05-2026****Registered on : 12-05-2026****Decided on : 21-05-2026**

Rajesh Kumar, aged about 41 years s/o Sohan Lal, resident of village Sandhanwal, PS Shahkot, District Jalandhar.

....Accused/applicant

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent.

FIR No.70 dated 27.03.2026
Under sections 318 (4), 308 (5), 304, 61 (2) BNS.
Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, Kapurthala

Application for bail under Section 483 BNSS

Present:- Sh. Satinderpal S. Khinda, Adv, for accused/applicant.
Ms. Sunpreet Kaur, Addl. P.P. for respondent/State.

ORDER:

1. The indulgence of the Court has been craved for by the applicant-accused by seeking regular bail under section 483 BNSS in above said FIR, on the averments that applicant/accused has been falsely implicated in the present case. There is no direct or indirect evidence against the applicant/accused to connect him with the commission of alleged crime. As the applicant/accused is ready to abide by all the terms

and conditions imposed upon him by the Court, he be released on regular bail and his bail application be allowed.

2. Notice of the bail application was issued to the respondent State and statement of HC Mandeep Singh No.623/Kpt.,PS Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala, has been recorded to the effect that no offence has been added or deleted after the registration of FIR and one previous FIR is pending against the above named accused/applicant. Learned Addl.PP for the State has contested the bail application by arguing that there are serious allegations against the applicant/accused. Considering the serious nature of allegations against the applicant/accused, Ld.Addl.PP has prayed for dismissal of the bail application.

3. The Court has given the thoughtful consideration to the rival contentions of both the parties and minutely perused the case file.

4. FIR in the case in hand stems in pursuance of statement suffered by Harwinder Singh son of Sucha Singh wherein it has been averred that he was desirous of some property near the city. On 27.03.2026 at about 11:40, he met co-accused Mona, who asked him to reach at particular place where the property was shown to the complainant. When complainant reached inside the said house, co-accused Mona removed her clothes and embraced the complainant. Meanwhile, co-accused Boota alongwith accused/applicant Rajesh Kumar entered into the said room and started making videos of him. Aforesaid accused/applicant and co-accused blackmailed the complainant and

extorted sum of Rs.75,000/- from him. Thereafter, demand of Rs.2 lakh was made from the complainant threatening him to make the said video and said photographs viral. In view of these allegations, the present FIR was registered against co-accused.

5. Primarily, the allegations are qua cheating, snatching and extortion. There is no document or statement of any person till now that ownership of the place of occurrence is of accused/applicant. Perusal of the police record reveals that recovery of Rs.20,000/- is stated to have been effected from the possession of accused/applicant on 29.03.2026 in pursuance of the disclosure statement. Only sum of Rs.20,000/- is stated to have been handed over by co-accused to accused/applicant which has already been recovered. The main allegations of making video recording is against co-accused and no offence under IT Act has been added by investigating agency.

6. Accused/applicant was arrested on 28.03.2026 and since then he is in custody. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the applicants/accused behind the bar any further. Criminality of accused/applicant can be appropriately adjudicated after appreciation of evidence upon trial. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present bail application is allowed and the applicant/accused is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds in the sum of **Rs.40,000/-** with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of learned Area/Duty Magistrate Court. Further conditions are:-

1. That the applicant/accused shall attend the Court on each and every date of hearing in accordance with the bonds executed by him/her;
2. That the applicant/accused shall not leave India without prior permission of the court;
3. That the applicant/accused shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence.
4. Applicant/accused shall not directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;
5. Applicant/accused shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which she is accused, or for the commission of which she suspected.
7. In case the surety is not available, accused/applicant may submit FDR or cash security may also be deposited.
8. Copy of this order be sent to the learned Illaqa/Duty Magistrate forthwith under the signatures of Reader for compliance. A soft copy of the bail order be sent by e-mail to the accused/applicant through the Jail Superintendent forthwith.

Pronounced in Open Court

Dated:-21.05.2026

Nitish

Directly Typed

(Rashmi Kapila)

Additional Sessions Judge,
Kapurthala.

UID No.PB00201

Rajesh Kumar Vs. St. of Pb.

BA/1100/2026

CNR No:PBKP010025292026

Present:- Sh. Satinderpal S. Khinda, Adv, for accused/applicant.
Ms. Sunpreet Kaur, Addl. P.P. for respondent/State.

Statement of HC Mandeep Singh has been recorded
regarding production of record.

Arguments heard.

Vide my separate detailed order of even date, the present bail
application has been **allowed**, as detailed therein. Police record be
returned. Bail application file be consigned to record room.

Pronounced in Open Court

Dated:-21.05.2026

Nitish

Directly Typed

(Rashmi Kapila)

Additional Sessions Judge,
Kapurthala.

UID No.PB00201