

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

2028.PHIC.054013



CRM-M-17427-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 08.04.2026

**LOVEPREET SINGH ALIAS LAVI
VERSUS**

... PETITIONER

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. Anmol Jindal, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (439 Cr.P.C.) in FIR No.62 dated 30.07.2024 under Sections 103/3(5) of BNS (corresponding Sections 302, 34 IPC) registered at Police Station Bajakhana, District Faridkot.

2. The case of the prosecution is that Jasjeet Singh @ Jassa was married to Gagandeep Kaur, who, due to matrimonial dispute, had been residing at her parental home in Village Thaman, District Moga. About 15–20 days prior to the occurrence, she returned to the matrimonial home at Village Ghania. On the day of the incident, the complainant namely Labhpreet Kaur called her brother Jasjeet Singh @ Jassa who did not take her calls. Later, she called Lakhvir Singh asking him to let her speak to her brother as he was not taking her calls. After sometime, Lakhvir Singh went to the house of her brother and informed her over the phone that her brother Jasjit Singh was lying on bed with blood all over. Upon receiving this information, the complainant went to the house of her brother and, on entering the bedroom, found him lying dead on the bed. He had sustained

injuries on his neck caused by a sharp-edged weapon and had succumbed to those injuries. It is alleged that the petitioner, along with co-accused Karan Gill, committed the murder of Jasjeet Singh @ Jassa.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that the petitioner has been nominated solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Karan Singh @ Karan Gill, who is the main accused. The petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 08 months and 01 day and is not involved in any other case.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Surinderjit Singh Nahar, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State and vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 08 months and 01 day. Out of 24 cited prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far.

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

7. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case that it is found that the case is based on circumstantial evidence and there is no direct evidence collected by the prosecution to implicate the petitioner in the commission of the offence; similarly placed co-accused Harpreet Singh @ Bhima has already been granted regular bail vide order dated 25.03.2026 passed in CRM-M-28894-2025; the petitioner is in custody for more than 01

year, 08 months and 01 day; out of 24 cited prosecution witnesses only 02 witnesses have been examined so far; the conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Reference can be made to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Pardeep Kumar @ Banu versus State of Punjab*, bearing Criminal Appeal No.1341/2026 (arising out of SLP(Cri.) No.18775/2025), decided on 13.03.2026, wherein it has been categorically held that where the accused has remained in custody for a considerable period and the trial has not even commenced, or is not likely to conclude in the near future, therefore, continued incarceration would amount to punishment without trial. In such circumstances, further detention pending trial is not necessary and the accused is entitled to be released on bail.

9. 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 trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

10. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

08.04.2026

Janki

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