



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

218

CRM-M-9124-2025

Date of decision: 27.05.2025

Lovepreet Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Simranjot S. Nagra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, AAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.148 dated 26.09.2017 under Sections 379-B, 419, 420, 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station City Batala, District Gurdaspur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was initially granted the concession of regular bail by the learned Trial Court vide order dated 14.11.2017 and had thereafter been regularly appearing before the learned Trial Court. However, on account of some miscommunication between the petitioner and his previous counsel, he was unable to appear before the learned Trial Court from 25.03.2022 onwards as a result of which he was subsequently declared a proclaimed offender on 11.08.2023. Learned counsel has contended that the absence of the petitioner before the learned Trial Court was neither deliberate nor wilful but was on account



CRM-M-9124-2025

-2-

of the aforesaid miscommunication and as per the legal advice rendered to him subsequently.

3. It has been further submitted that after the petitioner came to know that he had been declared a proclaimed offender, the petitioner voluntarily surrendered before the Court on 11.04.2024; he has been in custody thereafter.

4. Learned counsel has asserted that the petitioner is a victim of false implication. The trial is unlikely to conclude in the near future since as many as 12 prosecution witnesses remain to be examined. Still further, it has been asserted that since the material witness i.e. the complainant has already been examined, further incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose, and therefore, he be extended the concession of bail.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, has submitted that in case the petitioner is enlarged on bail at this stage moreso when the complainant has stood his ground before the learned Trial Court and clearly identified the petitioner as being the person who committed the crime in question, there is every likelihood that the petitioner could again abscond leading to further delay in the trial. Learned State counsel has reiterated the allegations levelled in the FIR in question annexed as Annexure P-1 and submitted that petitioner is one of the two persons who came on a motorcycle and after committing the crime in question i.e. snatching the gold chain of the complainant, fled away. It has been submitted that the delay in the trial



CRM-M-9124-2025

is attributable to the conduct of the petitioner and, therefore, he cannot derive any benefit much less seek the concession of bail on the said grounds.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

7. It is a matter of record that after the petitioner was initially arrested following the registration of the FIR in question, he jumped bail leading to the petitioner being declared a proclaimed offender. No doubt the petitioner did subsequently surrender before the learned Trial Court, however, the petitioner cannot now turn around and seek bail on account of the inordinate delay in the conclusion of the trial. Furthermore, the most material witness i.e. the complainant has clearly identified the petitioner as being the alleged assailant who had committed the crime in question. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the instant petition is hereby dismissed.

9. It is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. However, the learned Trial Court shall make earnest efforts to conclude the trial at the earliest.

27.05.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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