

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

2025.PHHC:001226



(238)

**CRM-M-64177-2024**  
**Date of decision: 08.01.2025**

Lovepreet Singh @ Labhi

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present : Mr. Shivender Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab  
for the respondent-State.

\*\*\*\*\*

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.05 dated 12.01.2022, under Sections 302, 34 IPC (lateron added Sections 427, 148,149 and 120-B IPC) and under Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Nathana District Bathinda.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that false implication of the petitioner in the present case is evident from the fact that neither he was named in the FIR in question nor any suspicion raised qua his involvement in the occurrence in question, wherein, two persons Manpreet Singh @ Challa and Manpreet Singh @ Vicky were murdered by co-accused. Learned counsel has asserted that it was 11 months after the alleged occurrence, the petitioner was nominated as an accused in the present case on the basis of a disclosure statement allegedly made by co-accused Baljinder Singh, who stated that the petitioner had supplied the weapon of offence to co-accused Sandeep Singh, who had thereafter carried out the twin murders. Learned counsel has still further submitted that co-accused Charanjit Singh, who had carried out the



twin murders, had been granted the concession of the bail on account of the fact that the material witnesses while stepping into the witness box had not supported the case of the prosecution, as a result of which, they were all declared hostile.

3. Learned counsel has submitted that since all the three material witnesses i.e Gursach Singh, Harmail Singh and Charanjit Singh have been examined and declared hostile during trial, further incarceration of the petitioner in the given circumstances would serve no useful purpose, moreover, when it is not even the case of the prosecution that the petitioner had inflicted any injury much-less fatal on either of the two deceased.

4. *Per Contra*, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, on instructions, has not disputed that the petitioner was not named in the FIR in question nor any suspicion raised qua his involvement in the twin murders. It has also not been disputed by the learned State counsel that the petitioner came to be nominated as an accused in the present case after 11 months of the alleged occurrence and therein also the role attributed to the petitioner was of having provided the weapon of offence to co-accused Sandeep Singh, who has since been extended the concession of bail on account of all the three material witnesses having been declared hostile before the trial Court.

5. However, learned State counsel has reiterated that although the material witnesses have been declared hostile by the prosecution, the weapon of offence with which the deceased had been gunned down had been provided by none other the petitioner.

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

7. The petitioner has been in custody for more than two years having been arrested on 23.12.2022. All the three material witnesses during their deposition before the trial Court had not supported the case of the

prosecution, as a result of which, they were declared hostile. The petitioner is not alleged to have inflicted any injury much-less fatal on the person of either of the deceased. The trial is unlikely to conclude in the near future as 13 prosecution witnesses still remain to be examined.

8. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, 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. Needless to add, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

08.01.2025 (MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
mamta JUDGE

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