

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRA-D-498-2025 (O&M)

JUDGEMENT RESERVED ON	JUDGEMENT PRONOUNCED ON	OPERATIVE PART PRONOUNCED OR FULL	UPLOADED ON
07.05.2026	19.05.2026	FULL PRONOUNCED	19.05.2026

Lovepreet Singh @ Labu @ Sandhu...Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

Present: Mr. Simranjit Singh, Advocate, for the appellant.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Section
184	21.10.2023	Balongi, Mohali	120-B, 121, 153 IPC and Sections 25 (7) (8), 54-59 of Arms Act (amended 2019) and 17-18-18B and 20 of Unlawful Activity Prevention Act, 1967 later on added Sections 21C-29-61-85 of NDPS Act

Criminal Case number before the Sessions Court	CIS No.BA-3903-2024 CNR No.PBSA0100-9656-2024
Date of Decision	19.12.2024

1. Aggrieved by the dismissal of regular bail by the Additional Sessions Judge, vide order dated 19.12.2024, the appellant had come before this Court by filing the present appeal, seeking bail in the FIR mentioned above.
2. As per the custody certificate dated 05.05.2026, the appellant has the following criminal antecedents: -

Sr. No.	FIR	Dated	Police Station	Sections
1.	31	07.04.2022	Kotli Surat Malhi	302, 201, 34 IPC, 25/54/59 of Arms Act
2	222	08.12.2025	Sadar Sangrur	21, 29, 61, 85 of NDPS Act
3	12	10.01.2026	Tripuri	21, 61, 85 of NDPS Act, 52-A of Prison Act

3. The facts of the case are being taken from status report dated 23.04.2026 filed by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Investigation, SAS Nagar, the same reads as under:-

“2. That with regard to the subject matter of the present petition, it is submitted that case/FIR No.184 dated 21.10.2023 under Sections 120-B, 121, 153 IPC, Section 25 (7), 25 (8) of Arms Act and Section 17, 18, 18-B, 20 of Unlawful Activities Prevention Act was registered at Police Station Balongi, District S.A.S Nagar against Shakeel Ahmed @ Laddi Gujjar, Karanbir Singh @Raja, Nirbair Singh @ Sehajpreet Singh @ Mani, Lovepreet Singh, Saroop Singh, Harpreet Singh @ Happy Panchiya, Nishan Singh and Harwinder Singh @ Rinda on the ruqa of SI Aman Deep Verma that on 21.10.2023, he along with police party accompanied with laptop and printer was present near Drain Pull, Village Balongi for patrolling and checking of suspicious persons. During this time, a Desh Sewak approached SI Aman Deep Verma and provided information regarding the involvement of the accused in various criminal activities. The informant stated that Shakeel Ahmed @ Laddi Gujjar, Karanbir Singh @ Raja, Nirbair Singh @ Sehajpreet Singh @ Sunny, Lovepreet Singh (appellant) and Saroop Singh had formed a criminal gang and that several heinous crime cases were registered against them in multiple police stations across Punjab. It was further disclosed that the accused have links with Harpreet Singh @ Happy Panchiya, Nishan Singh and Harwinder Singh @ Rinda, the leader of the banned organization Babbar Khalsa International (BKI), which is prohibited by the Government of India and currently operates out of Pakistan. The accused, in collusion with the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) of Pakistan are engaged in activities aimed at undermining the unity and integrity of India by orchestrating terrorist attacks, Harwinder Singh @ Rinda has reportedly been recruiting youth into BKI by channelling funds into the accounts of his associates Harpreet Singh @ Happy Panchiya and Nishan Singh. These funds are said to be used for procuring foreign weapons through smuggling and drones. It is believed that the accused through their conspiracy, could target religious, political and other high-profile individuals in Punjab and other States of India. It was further reported that Shakeel Ahmed @ Laddi Gujjar was present under the Bridge, Balongi, Mohali, Kharar Road awaiting an individual described as wearing a red and black shawl and carrying a backpack and in case, if apprehended, Shakeel Ahmed @ Laddi Gujjar could lead to the recovery of foreign weapons and potentially prevent a major incident. Finding the

aforesaid information to be trustworthy and reliable and the prima facie offences under Sections 120-B, 121, 153 IPC, Section 25 (7), 25 (8) of Arms Act and Section 17, 18, 18-B, 20 of Unlawful Activities Prevention Act to be made out against the aforesaid persons, the ruqa was sent for registration of FIR and consequently, case/FIR No.184 (supra) was registered against the aforesaid persons including the appellant.”

4. We have heard counsel for the parties and gone through the record, including the reply and its analysis, which would lead to the following outcome.

5. It would be appropriate to refer following paragraphs of the status report, which reads as follows:

“xxx xxxx The appellant and his accomplices, in collusion with the Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) of Pakistan are engaged in activities aimed at undermining the unity and integrity of India by orchestrating terrorist attacks. Furthermore, during the investigation, the appellant was found in possession of one pistol .30 bore, along with 60 live cartridges for .30 bore pistol was recovered from the bed at his residence. Furthermore, during investigation Lovepreet Singh @ Labhu (appellant) is an active member of the said module and was involved in a criminal conspiracy relating to target killing, concealment of illegal arms. xxxx xxx”

6. A perusal of the evidence collected against the appellant clearly points towards his involvement, which is established and corroborated by recovery of pistol along with 60 live cartridges. In addition to this, the appellant has massive criminal history as mentioned in para 19 of the status report, which involves a case of murder, two cases of NDPS Act and 02 cases of extortion. Even such evidence and criminal history, he is not entitled for bail. Even otherwise, there is no illegality in the order passed by the trial Court and the same is upheld. Thus, in the entirety of facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the appellant

7. In UOI Rep. by Insp. of NIA v. Barakathullah, [2024] 5 S.C.R. 1011; 2024 INSC 452, May 22, 2024, the Hon’ble Supreme Court holds,

[2]. The Central Government in Ministry of Home Affairs, CTCR Division having received a credible information that the office bearers, members and cadres of Popular Front of India (PFI), an extremist Islamic organization have been spreading its extremist ideology across Tamil Nadu, by establishing State Headquarters at Purasaiwakkam, Chennai and also offices in various districts of Tamil Nadu and that through their frontal Organizations like Campus Front of India, National Women’s Front, Social Democratic Party of India etc., they conspire for committing terrorist acts, raise funds for committing terrorist activities and recruit members for furthering their extremist ideology, and that

the frontal organizations and PFI were involved in the recruitment of members to various prescribed terrorist organizations, passed an order on 16th September 2022, in exercise of the powers conferred under sub-section (5) of Section 6 read with Section 8 of the National Investigation Agency Act, 2008 (hereinafter referred to as the ‘NIA Act’), directing the National Investigation Agency to take up investigation of the said case. In view of the said order, an FIR being RC-42/2022/NIA/DLI came to be registered on 19.09.2022 against the present respondents and other members and office bearers of PFI for the offences under Section 120(b), 153(A), 153(AA) of IPC and Section 13,17,18,18(B), 38 and 39 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1957 (hereinafter referred to as the “UAPA”).

[22]. In the instant case, we are satisfied from the chargesheet as also the other material/documents relied upon by the appellant that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accusations against the respondents are prima facie true and that the mandate contained in the proviso to Section 43(D)(5) would be applicable for not releasing the respondents on bail. Having regard to the seriousness and gravity of the alleged offences, previous criminal history of the respondents as mentioned in the charge-sheet, the period of custody undergone by the respondents being hardly one and half years, the severity of punishment prescribed for the alleged offences and prima facie material collected during the course of investigation, the impugned order passed by the High Court cannot be sustained. We are conscious of the legal position that we should be slow in interfering with the order when the bail has been granted by the High Court, however it is equally well settled that if such order of granting bail is found to be illegal and perverse, it must be set aside.

8. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.
9. Petition dismissed. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

19.05.2026
jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned	YES
Whether reportable	NO