



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

Sr. No.105

CRM-M-26290-2026
Date of Decision: 11.05.2026

LOVEPREET SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Vikram Satpal Anand, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023/438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.44 dated 08.04.2025, registered under Sections 221, 132 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (erstwhile Sections 186, 353 and 34 IPC), at Police Station Civil Lines, Police District Police Commissionerate, District Amritsar.

2. Briefly stated, the present FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant ASI Rajinder Kumar, who alleged that while he was posted as LR/ASI in Punjab Police and deputed as Naib Court at District Courts, Amritsar, he received information from the SHO, Police Station Kathunangal, that accused Lovepreet Singh, who was wanted in FIR No.112 dated 29.10.2024 under Sections 109, 118(2), 115(2), 191(3) and 190 BNS and FIR No.113 dated 29.10.2024 under Section 25 of the Arms Act, was roaming near old Post Office, District Courts, Amritsar. Thereafter,



the complainant along with other police officials reached the spot to apprehend the accused, who allegedly tried to flee away but was apprehended. It is further alleged that in the meantime, father, mother and wife of the accused reached the spot, manhandled the police officials and facilitated the escape of the accused from police custody, thereby obstructing the police officials in discharge of their official duties.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and no such occurrence, as alleged in the FIR, ever took place. It has further been contended that the father of the petitioner is serving in Punjab Police and owing to a minor dispute with certain police officials, the entire family of the petitioner has been implicated in the present case. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency. It is also contended that although other criminal cases are stated to be pending against the petitioner, the same cannot be made a ground to deny the concession of anticipatory bail in the present case.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Learned State counsel has contended that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as he was already wanted in other criminal cases and when the police party attempted to apprehend him, he tried to flee from the spot. It is further contended that the petitioner, along



with his family members, obstructed the police officials from discharging their official duties and succeeded in escaping from lawful custody. Learned State counsel further submits that the petitioner is involved in multiple criminal cases of serious nature, including cases under the Arms Act and NDPS Act, thereby showing his criminal antecedents. It is also argued that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation and in case the concession of anticipatory bail is granted, there is every likelihood that the petitioner may evade the process of law or influence the investigation.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the paper-book. The allegations levelled in the FIR reveal that the petitioner was specifically named and sought to be apprehended by the police in connection with other criminal cases, however, he attempted to flee from the spot and was ultimately rescued with the active intervention of his family members, who allegedly manhandled and obstructed the police officials in discharge of their official duties. The role attributed to the petitioner cannot be said to be minor or insignificant. The conduct of the petitioner in evading lawful apprehension and obstructing police action *prima facie* disentitles him from the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail. Moreover, the petitioner is stated to be involved in several other criminal cases, including offences under the Arms Act and NDPS Act, which also reflects adversely upon his conduct.

8. Keeping in view the nature and gravity of allegations, the requirement of custodial interrogation and the overall facts and



circumstances of the case, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

- 9. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.
- 10. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

11.05.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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