

253

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

**CRM-M No. 20799 of 2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 08.01.2024**

Lovepreet Singh alias Lovi

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Vinay Puri, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurlal Singh Dhillon, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of regular bail pending trial in case FIR No. 191, dated 27.11.2021, under Sections 302, 201 & 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Nakodar Sadar, District Jalandhar Rural, whereby the petitioner has been implicated for having caused a murder of one Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi, i.e. son of the complainant.

[2] Status report by way of affidavit dated 06.11.2023 of Sh. Sukhpal Singh, PPS, DSP, Sub Divison Nakodar, District Jalandahr (Rural), filed on behalf of respondent, is taken on record. Copy thereof supplied to the opposite side.

[3] Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the investigation in the present case stands concluded with the filing of challan and the petitioner is in custody since 27.11.2021.

[4] On the other hand, learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer while submitting that it was the petitioner, who injected narcotic to the deceased-Gurpeet Singh @ Gopi, which resulted into his death due to overdose; thus, he does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

[5] I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper-book. I find substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

[6] In the present case, the petitioner is in custody since 27.11.2021 and investigation stands concluded with the filing of challan and out of seventeen (17), only (07) prosecution witnesses have been examined. Even the complainant-Amarjit Singh, who is father of deceased, appeared as PW-1, did not support the version of prosecution, never named the petitioner as the person responsible for the death of his son, thereby creating a strong dent in the prosecution version and thus, I do not see any reason to extend the incarceration of the petitioner any further.

[7] In view of the above, but without commenting upon merits of the present petition, the same is **allowed**. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds / surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

[8] However, in case the petitioner indulges himself in similar kind of activity, the prosecution shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted in favour of the petitioner in the present case.

January 08, 2024

'dk kamra'

**(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE**

<i>Whether Speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>