



CRM-M-21240-2025 (O&M) -1-

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

228

**CRM-M-21240-2025 (O&M)
Decided on: 19.11.2025**

JASPREET ALIAS LOVEPREET ALIAS LABBU

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Gourav Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. This is the second petition which has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.496 dated 10.09.2023 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 379-B, 506 IPC, (Sections 325/307 IPC, 1860 added later on) and under Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station City Tohana, District Fatehabad.

2. Brief facts of the case are that on 10.09.2023, complainant Sunny got recorded his statement alleging that on 09.09.2023, the complainant and Ranjeet Singh on motorcycle had gone for a ride and while standing at the edge of the road, Krishan @ Boxer, Sanju, Sanju Saini, Karamvir, Lakhu, Labbu, Parveen alias Goni, and Sunil Badam in two Bolero vehicles came there and were carrying lathis in their hands. After alighting from their vehicles, Krishan along with other assailants attacked upon them with lathis. All the assailants caused injuries to him



(complainant) and Ranjeet Singh and he (complainant) suffered injuries on his both legs and left knee. The petitioner namely, Labbu, who was having a pistol, pointed upon them and extended threat to kill them and he snatched wallet containing Rs.10,000/- from his pocket. On seeing passersby on the spot, all the assailants alongwith their weapons fled away from the spot after sitting in their vehicles.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that earlier the petitioner had approached this Court for bail and the Court had directed vide order dated 14.11.2025 to avail the remedy after the examination of material witnesses. He further contended that both the material witnesses i.e. injured-Ranjit Singh and complainant-Sunny have already been examined and in support thereof, has placed on record their depositions. It is further contended that name of the present petitioner is not mentioned specifically in the FIR and the main allegations are against the co-accused namely Krishan @ Boxer, Sanju @ Jhota & Lakhwinder @ Lakhu who have already been granted the concession of bail vide orders dated 04.03.2025 & 28.03.2025, respectively by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad. He also contended that the present petitioner is in custody since 13.03.2024 i.e. for the last more than 01 and half year. The main injuries are also not attributed to the petitioner and the same are attributed to Krishan @ Boxer who has already been granted bail by the trial Court and the petitioner thus, prayed for bail.

4. Notice of motion.



5. Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposed the concession of regular bail to the petitioner by way of filing custody certificate dated 18.11.2025 and submitted that the present petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in 15 heinous crimes. It is however, not disputed that the co-accused is also having criminal antecedents who has already been granted the concession of bail by the trial Court.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that main witnesses have already been examined in this case; the co-accused have already been released on bail by the trial Court; the present petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 and ½ year and is not named specifically in the FIR; moreover, bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment as culpability of the accused will be decided at the final stage by the Trial Court after adducing of evidence by both the sides; this Court finds merit in the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner and deems it a fit case to grant concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.



8. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an opinion on the merits of the main case.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

19.11.2025
Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO