



CRM-M-26540-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-26540-2025

Date of Decision: 08.12.2025

Lovejeet Singh @ Lovejit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Jaskirat Singh Bhogal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.171 dated 23.11.2023 under Sections 326, 148, 149, 307 IPC, registered at Police Station Bhikhiwind, District Tarn Taran.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of complainant Siwat Sada. It was alleged that in the intervening night of 05/06.10.2023, at about 12:30/01:00 in the night, when he was sleeping with his colleagues in a tent, he heard hue and cry outside the tent. After hearing the same, he came out. However, one person wearing turban came running towards him armed with *kirpan* and gave *kirpan* blow on his head and he fell on the ground. On raising alarm, his colleagues also came out of the tent, however, the assailant escaped. The complainant was shifted to the hospital by his colleagues. Request was made to take legal action against the accused person. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During investigation, complicity of the petitioner was surfaced and hence, he was arrested on 15.05.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn



Taran praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 02.08.2024. Earlier also, the petitioner approached this Court thrice by way of filing CRM-M-42311-2024, CRM-M-49169-2024 and CRM-M-62785-2024, however, the same were dismissed as withdrawn/dismissed vide orders dated 04.09.2024, 04.10.2024 and 18.12.2024, respectively. Hence, the petitioner has again approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present fourth petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. To buttress his arguments, he submits that incident in the present case was taken place in the intervening night of 05/06.10.2023, whereas, the FIR was registered on 23.11.2023 i.e. after an unexplained delay of more than 1½ months. He submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other criminal case. It is submitted that since the last 5-6 dates of hearing before the trial Court, the complainant, even after having been issued with non-bailable warrants, is not appearing for his deposition only in order to prolong the incarceration of the petitioner. He, thus, submits that in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that it is the petitioner, who gave *kirpan* blow on the head of the petitioner. He submits that on the



very same day of the occurrence, the complainant got himself medically examined before the Civil Hospital. He submits that the complainant is a labourer and delay occurred in lodging the FIR, does not vitiate the trial. However, on instructions, he submits that the complainant is not traceable. The Investigating Agency has tried to contact the complainant, but his phone is also found switched off. On instructions, he further submits that out of total 12 prosecution witnesses, 04 witnesses have been examined. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested on 15.05.2024 in this case. The FIR has been lodged after a delay of about 1½ months. As submitted before this Court, the complainant is not traceable. As per custody certificate of the petitioner, he has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 06 months & 21 days as on 07.12.2025. It further shows that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Out of total 12 prosecution witnesses, 04 prosecution witnesses have been examined.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is



CRM-M-26540-2025

-4-

ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. However, it is being clarified that in case the petitioner is found to be misusing the concession of bail granted by this Court, the prosecution would be at liberty to file a petition for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

08.12.2025

sharmila

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No