

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

**CRM-M-649-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 01.08.2022**

Lovejit Singh @ Love @ Lovejeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Ms. Sukhpreet Kaur Grewal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Multani, AAG Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-16092-2022

Application is allowed as prayed for. Annexures A/1 to A/5 are taken on record.

CRM-6475-2021

Application is allowed as prayed for. Annexure P-10 is taken on record.

CRM-27563-2021

Application is allowed as prayed for. Annexure P-11 is taken on record.

Main case:

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 15 dated 26.03.2019, registered under

Section 302 IPC read with Section 34 IPC, Sections 25, 27, 54, 59 of the Arms Act, and later on added Sections 120-B, 506, 148, 149 IPC, at Police Station Verowal, District Tarn Taran.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case, because of previous enmity; that the petitioner has no role to play in the alleged occurrence; that it is a case of blind murder; that the complainant in his supplementary statement named five persons including the present petitioner, but no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner; that co-accused, Vijay Singh, who has been attributed the fire shot injury, has already been granted anticipatory bail and that the petitioner has been in custody since 28.11.2020. As far as other cases are concerned, in those cases also the petitioner was indicted on the basis of supplementary statements and he is on bail in those cases.

Learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender and the petitioner has specific motive in the present case. However, he does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner and the fact that the petitioner was named by the complainant in his supplementary statement. He submits that the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 28.11.2020. The petitioner was named by the complainant in his supplementary statement and no specific role has been attributed to him. In other cases registered or pending against the petitioner, he is on bail in those cases. The prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. Therefore, the conclusion of the trial would

take time. Hence, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

01.08.2022

Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No