



CRM-M-24721-2025

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

238

CRM-M-24721-2025
Date of Decision: 02.09.2025

LOVEPREET SINGH @ LOVE @ SHOOTER

....PETITIONER

Versus.

STATE OF PUNJAB

....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE Rajesh Bhardwaj

Present: - Mr.Amit Arora, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms.Simran Gorla, AAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting regular bail in case FIR No.91 dated 16.08.2019 under Sections 115, 120-B IPC and Sections 21, 22, 29 and 30 of the NDPS Act (offence under Section 27-A of the NDPS Act and Section 25 of the Arms Act were added lateron), registered at Police Station Khilchian, District Amritsar Rural.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that FIR was registered in the present case on the statement of Nishan Singh, who is ex sarpanch of the Village. It has been alleged that as he is against the selling of drugs in the society and organised seminars as well. Hence, Balkar Singh being involved in smuggling of narcotics had kept grudge against him. Thus he had extended threat to him to be killed in connivance with one Meeta and one unidentified person. On this allegation, FIR was lodged and investigation commenced. During investigation, petitioner was also arrayed as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused. Hence he was

**CRM-M-24721-2025**

apprehended. However, this Court vide order dated 01.04.2021 passed in CRM-M-4228-2021 had granted bail to him. However, petitioner remained absent during the trial and hence his bail was cancelled and thereafter, he was declared as proclaimed offender on 12.08.2024. Subsequently, he was arrested and since then he is behind bars. He had approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, for grant of bail. However, the same had been declined on 28.03.2025. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court by way of present petition.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that there is no involvement of the petitioner in the alleged offence. However, he had been arrayed as an accused on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused. He submits that petitioner had been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 01.04.2021, but he remained absent on one date due to unavoidable reasons and subsequently as well and he has been declared as proclaimed offender. He submits that co-accused are on bail. However, there is no progress in the trial. He submits that in the facts and circumstances, petitioner be granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State submits that petitioner was already granted interim bail, but he misused the concession of same and he was declared Proclaimed Offender on 12.08.2024. She submits, on instructions, that out of 12 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined so far. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in Court which is taken on record.

5. On hearing, it is deciphered that the petitioner has been arrayed as accused in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-

**CRM-M-24721-2025**

accused and he had granted bail by this Court vide order dated 01.04.2021 in CRM-M-4228-2021 though he was declared Proclaimed Offender, but thereafter he has been arrested 03.12.2024 and since then he is behind bars. Out of the total 12 witnesses, no witness has been examined. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year 02 months and 06 days and he is involved in 7 more cases and is on bail in 6 of them and in one he is in custody.

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. Thus, keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, 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 ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. It is being clarified that in the case the petitioner does not furnish bail/surety bonds within a period of one week from today, his custody will not be counted in the present case after one week.

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

02.09.2025*Vivek***(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No