



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

226

**CRM-M-2316 of 2026
Date of Decision: 11.03.2026**

Lovepreet Singh @ Bablu

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. G.S.Ghuman, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Amritpal Singh, DAG, Punjab.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Present is the 3rd petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 86, dated 17.08.2022 registered under Section 364 of the Indian Penal Code (Sections 302, 201, 212, 34 of IPC added later on), at Police Station Payal, District Ludhiana.
2. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that the petitioner, in connivance with other co-accused, committed murder of one Jagdev Singh@Kala and also caused disappearance of his body.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no connection whatsoever with the alleged offence. It is contended that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor has any witness stated that the petitioner was



last seen in the company of the deceased prior to his death. He further submitted that there is no eye-witness to the alleged occurrence and that the petitioner has not played any role in the death of the deceased, Jagadev Singh. It is argued that the petitioner has been arraigned as an accused solely on the basis of an alleged statement made by one Hardeep Singh, who is stated to be the Sarpanch of the village. It is further submitted that, apart from the alleged extra-judicial confession purportedly made before the said Hardeep Singh, there exists no other incriminating material against the petitioner. Learned counsel also contends that the prosecution case rests entirely upon circumstantial evidence. He further submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 19.08.2022, therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars, particularly when he has already undergone prolonged incarceration during the pendency of the trial. Hence, he prayed that the present petition be allowed.

4. Per contra, learned counsel for the state has filed status report in the matter, which is taken on record, and he, while relying upon the same, has vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioner for grant of bail. It is submitted that the petitioner was actively involved in the commission of the murder of the deceased, Jagdev Singh and inflicted a blow with a danda on the head of the deceased, which resulted in his death and after committing the murder, the petitioner threw the dead body of the deceased into a canal with the intention of concealing the evidence of the crime. Learned counsel for the State further submitted that during the course of investigation, the petitioner got recovered the danda allegedly used in the commission of the offence as well as the clothes of the deceased-Jagdev Singh. It was also contended that,



as per the post-mortem report of the deceased Jagadev Singh, the deceased had sustained as many as eight injuries. The cause of death, as opined in the post-mortem report, is stated to be the injuries described therein, which were ante-mortem in nature. It is further submitted that the petitioner is also involved in multiple other criminal cases, which indicates that he is a habitual offender. Hence, he prayed that the present petition is devoid of merit and deserves to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully perused the record of the case. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, as he is stated to have inflicted a blow with a danda on the head of the deceased, Jagadev Singh, which resulted in his death, and thereafter threw the dead body into a canal in an attempt to conceal the evidence of the crime. Furthermore, during the course of investigation, the petitioner is stated to have got recovered the weapon of offence as well as the clothes of the deceased. The petitioner is stated to have made extra judicial confession to Hardeep Singh regarding the commission of crime and his role, the veracity of which can't be gone into at this stage. Moreover, the present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking bail mainly on the ground of his prolonged custody. It is trite law that mere prolonged period of custody or the fact that the trial is likely to take time by itself or coupled with the period of incarceration are not sufficient grounds for enlarging an accused on bail, when the offence alleged is serious. Reference in this context can be had to the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Kalyan Chandra Sarkar v. Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav, 2004 AIR(SC) 1866, Chenna Boyanna Krishna Yadav v. State of Maharashtra, (2007) 1 SCC 242** and



CRM-M-2316 of 2026

-4-

State through CBI v. Amaramani Tripathi, 2005 (4) RCR (Criminal) 280(SC).

6. In view of the seriousness of the allegations, the nature of the evidence collected during investigation, and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of bail to the petitioner at this stage.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

11.03.2026*D.Bansal....*

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