

223 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-47347-2023
Decided on : 25.09.2023

Lovepreet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Sukhveer Singh Killianwali, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

1. Instant petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking concession of regular bail in case FIR No.14 dated 03.06.2023 under Section 25 of Arms Act and 120-B IPC (Sections 379, 411 and 482 IPC is added later on) registered at Police Station Special Operation Cell District Amritsar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that a false case has been planted upon the petitioner, who is a 18 year old boy on the allegations that he along with two co-accused, were travelling in a stolen car with a fake number plate. Learned counsel further submits that the police had also planted a false recovery of arms and ammunition from the aforesaid vehicle. Learned counsel still further submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 03.06.2023 and as the investigation

in the case in hand is complete, his further incarceration would serve no useful purpose.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer made by the counsel opposite has submitted that a secret information was received qua the involvement of the accused including the petitioner in the crime in question and also to the effect that they had close links with terrorists based out of Pakistan. When the car in which the petitioner and the co-accused were travelling, was intercepted, recovery of arms and ammunition was effected from it. Still further, the fake number plate on the stolen vehicle, had been prepared by the petitioner. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has further informed the Court that co-accused Sukhdev Singh as well as Jatinder Singh are involved in at least 20 other criminal cases. Learned counsel has submitted that since all the three including the petitioner were travelling together when they were apprehended, it clearly hinted to the active participation of the petitioner in the crime in question. A prayer has, therefore, been made for dismissal of the instant petition as there was a likelihood that the petitioner could abscond during trial.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

5. The petitioner has been in custody since 03.06.2023. No doubt, challan has been presented, however, charges have not yet been framed. Still further, in the wake of the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the

concession of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

6. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

25.09.2023
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable :	Yes/No