



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

214

CRM-M-39847-2025

Date of decision: 02.08.2025

Lovepreet Singh alias Preet

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL**

Present: Mr. Davinder Singh Saini, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Kamalpreet Bawa, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.04 dated 03.01.2024, under Sections 302, 34 IPC registered at Police Station Sahnewal, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana.

2. The case of the prosecution is that petitioner along with his co-accused had caused injuries to the deceased Gurcharan who succumbed to the injuries. Initially, petitioner was not named in the FIR but later on his name was surfaced on the basis of disclosure statement made by one Billa main accused.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as no test identification parade was conducted and PW-3 Ashok Kumar and PW-4 Sukhdev Singh have not supported the case of the prosecution. Moreover, petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year, 6 months and 22 days and out of 17 prosecution witnesses, only 4 have been examined so far. He prayed that petitioner be released on bail pending trial.

4. Notice of motion.



5. Mr. Kamalpreet Bawa, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed custody certificate of the petitioner in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year, 6 months and 22 days.

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

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that out of 17 prosecution witnesses, only 4 have been examined, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. 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 bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)  
JUDGE

02.08.2025

anil

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