



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

**CRM-M No.5017 of 2025
Reserved on : 08.05.2025
Pronounced on: 09.05.2025**

LOVEPREET SINGH

.... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present : Ms. G.K. Mann, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Armandeep Kaur Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sukhdeep Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner for grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.1 dated 03.01.2022 registered under Sections 302, 307, 379-B, 201, 120-B, 34, 473 of IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, at Police Station Kotli Surat Mallian, District Gurdaspur.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Harminder Singh alleging therein that his wife was Sarpranch of Village Dehar. On the same day i.e. on 03.01.2022, some officials from Mandikaran Board came to his village for survey of the streets. He was accompanying them. They had visited the area near the Church and while returning back, he was called by the present petitioner and co-accused who told him that they would not let the booth of Congress Party (to which the complainant was affiliated) set in the village and also threatened that



the complainant would be able to construct streets only if he would remain alive. Without giving any response, the complainant came back to his house. He alleged that on the same evening, the victim Dilpreet Singh who was grandson of his uncle visited his home along with his wife, mother and one friend namely Saurav. After having tea etc., the complainant along with the victim and his friend Saurav took him outside the house to show the development work done in the village and when they had reached near Bohar, the petitioner and co-accused Peter @ Nindu intercepted them by stopping a Swift car bearing registration No. PB-06-Z-4550. They were armed with pistols. They started hurling abuses. The victim tried to take out his licensed revolver but the petitioner caught hold of him and then the co-accused fired two shots upon the victim. The petitioner fired shots thereby injuring the left shoulder and right thigh of the complainant, he too fell down on the ground.

3. As per the further allegations, on raising rescue alarm by Saurav, the assailants fled away. The injured were rushed to the hospital but the victim Dilpreet had succumbed to the injuries. The complainant prayed for taking action by alleging that due to political rivalry, the petitioner and co-accused had assaulted them and killed his nephew.

4. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 07.11.2022. The investigation has since been completed. The petitioner had moved an application for grant of regular bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur vide order dated 03.12.2024.

5. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is delay of 12 hours in lodging of the FIR



which has not been explained. Inconsistent versions have been given by the witnesses and the FIR itself suffers from material inconsistencies. The prosecution version is improbable and unnatural. Even as per the allegations in the FIR, it was only after Dilpreet Singh, member of the complainant party attempted to draw his revolver that the petitioner had fired at him. The trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. He is in custody since long. The co-accused Gurnoor Singh has been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended same benefit. His further incarceration would not serve any purpose. Accordingly, it is urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of bail.

6. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. He is a habitual offender since 4 other cases have been registered against him. It was he who had fired shots at the victim Dilpreet Singh and had even struck blow with the handle of the pistol on his head. His case is not at all at parity with the case of co-accused Gurnoor Singh. There are chances of petitioner's intimidating the witnesses or absconding if extended benefit of bail. Accordingly, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. This Court has heard rival submission of the parties.

8. The petitioner by hatching a conspiracy and in furtherance of his common intention with the co-accused is alleged to have opened an assault upon victim Dilpreet Singh, complainant and PW-Saurav on the fateful day and is further alleged to have committed murder of the victim and made attempt to kill the complainant as well as Saurav. There are specific allegations against him that he had caused fetal injuries to the victim Dilpreet Singh by



using fire arms and had made attempt to kill the complainant in broad day light. Prolonged period of custody in such likes cases cannot be considered as solitary consideration for grant of bail. Keeping in view the nature of the allegations, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case but without meaning to make any comment on the merits thereof, I am of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed at this stage. Hence, the same is dismissed.

9. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

09.05.2025
Jyoti-IV

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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