



CRM-M-34472-2026(O&M)

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

228

CRM-M-34472-2026 (O&M)

Decided on :08.09.2026

Kashish Uppal @ Sofia Uppal

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Adeshwar Singh Pannu, Asst. A.G., Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present second petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 0011 dated 08.08.2023, under Sections 120-B IPC (Section 61 of the BNS), 199 IPC (Section 236 of the BNS), 200 IPC (Section 237 of the BNS), 211 IPC (Section 248 of the BNS), 384 IPC (Section 308 of the BNS), 420 IPC (Section 318(4) of the BNS), 388 IPC (Section 308 of the BNS), 389 IPC, 465 IPC (Section 336 of the BNS), 467 IPC (338 of BNS), section 468 IPC (section 336(3) of BNS), section 471 IPC (Section 340(2) of the BNS), registered at Police Station State Crime Police Station, SAS Nagar, District Mohali.

First petition, i.e. CRM-M-60844-2025, filed by the petitioner, was dismissed as withdrawn at that stage vide order dated 26.02.2026 (P-6).



2. Primarily, the allegations against the petitioner and the co-accused are that, pursuant to an investigation conducted by AIG, Crime Zone, Amritsar, it was revealed that one Veronika @ Divyanshi Kanwar, in connivance with the present petitioner, got multiple cases registered in the State of Punjab and Delhi with the ulterior motive of extorting money from individuals by making false allegations of rape against them. The details of such cases, along with their present status, are mentioned in paragraph No. 4 of the status report, which reads as under:

Sr. No.	Details of FIR	Complainant	Registered against	Present Status
1.	FIR No.55 dated 20.03.2021 under Sections 376 of IPC, 6 of POCSO Act, PS Cantonment, Amritsar	Kashish Uppal	Sagar Sidoría	Untrace cancellation accepted by District Court
2.	FIR No.243 dated 09.08.2021 under sections 376, 506 of IPC, 4 of POCSO Act, PS Division No.8, Ludhiana	Kashish Uppal	Shubham Kumar	Accused acquitted as per orders dated 06.11.2023.
3.	FIR No.172 dated 27.08.2021 under Sections 376 of IPC, 4 of POCSO Act, PS Urban Estate, Patiala	Kashish Uppal	Deepak Kumar	Declared innocent by learned trial Court
4.	FIR No.407 dated 27.05.2022 under Sections 376, 354, 506 of IPC, 6 of POCSO Act, PS Punjabi West, Delhi	Kashish Uppal	Amit Garg and Kapil Aggarwal	Still pending in Delhi Court

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since 13.03.2024, i.e. for a period of approximately 02 years, 05 months and 22 days.



CRM-M-34472-2026(O&M)

3

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that co-accused Rohit Sehgal was granted bail by the learned Trial Court vide order dated 22.09.2023 (P-3). It is, however, submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that, subsequently, during investigation, he was declared innocent.

Another co-accused, namely, Veronika @ Divyanshi Kanwar, was also ordered to be released on bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 04.07.2025 (P-4). She had remained in custody for a period of approximately 01 year and 03 months. As recorded in the order dated 04.07.2025 (supra), all the offences are triable by the Court of the learned Magistrate.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that, out of a total of 30 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined and 01 witness has been given up, therefore, trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Learned counsel accordingly prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for grant of regular bail, submits that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. It is further submitted that the detailed status report has been filed, along with the custody certificate of the petitioner, which reflect his involvement in the alleged offence and the stage of the trial.

Learned State counsel submits that the petitioner is alleged to have connived with co-accused Veronika @ Divyanshi Kanwar in getting multiple cases registered on false allegations with the ulterior



CRM-M-34472-2026(O&M)

4

motive of extorting money from the alleged victims. It is further submitted that the prosecution has cited 30 witnesses, out of whom only 02 have been examined, while 01 witness has been given up. Learned State counsel, therefore, opposes the grant of regular bail to the petitioner and prays for dismissal of the present petition.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

8. Keeping in view the fact that petitioner is in custody since 13.03.2024 and has already undergone incarceration for a substantial period of about 02 years and 05 months; co-accused Rohit Sehgal was granted bail by the learned Trial Court vide order dated 22.09.2023 and was subsequently declared innocent during investigation; co-accused Veronika @ Divyanshi Kanwar was also granted bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 04.07.2025 after remaining in custody for about 01 year and 03 months; all the offences are triable by the learned Magistrate; and out of 30 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined and 01 witness has been given up, this Court is of the considered view that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time.

Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the

**CRM-M-34472-2026(O&M)****5**

satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Before parting with the order, this Court deems it appropriate to observe that with the advancement of technology, means of communication have evolved substantially and have facilitated the sharing of information across jurisdictions. In cases involving allegations of repeated or habitually filing of complaints, particularly where the antecedents of the complainant or the accused may have relevance, there is a need to consider whether a suitable national-level portal or database can be developed wherein such antecedents, subject to appropriate safeguards and verification, may be made available to the concerned investigating agencies. Such a mechanism may enable the agencies across the country to have prior information regarding the antecedents of persons involved in repeated proceedings and, wherever legally permissible and relevant, place such information before the competent Court at the appropriate stage. This would assist the investigating agencies as well as the Courts in taking an informed view, while ensuring that the rights and privacy of individuals are duly protected.

10. Any observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. Learned trial Court shall proceed to decide the case independently, on the basis of evidence available on record, in accordance with law and as expeditiously as possible.



CRM-M-34472-2026(O&M)

11. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

08.09.2026
Rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No