



CRM-27609-2024 in/and CRA-D-968-2024

-1-

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

CRM-27609-2024 in/and CRA-D-968-2024

Date of decision : 19.03.2026

Manpreet Singh alias Lata

.....Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present: Mr. Baljinder Singh, Advocate (arguing counsel), and
Mr. Jainainder Saini, Advocate,
for the appellant.

Mr. Salil Sabhlok, Senior DAG, Punjab.

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)**CRM-27609-2024**

Heard on the application for condonation of delay in filing the
appeal.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances, as mentioned in the
application, delay of 362 days in filing the instant appeal (CRA-D-968-2024)
is condoned for the time being, subject to the final decision to be taken by
Apex Court in **'Sushila Devi & Anr. Vs. Union of India through NIA &
Ors.'**, wherein the question as to whether the limitation prescribed u/s 45 (2)
of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 is mandatory or not, is
pending consideration for 24.03.2026.

CRM-27609-2024 is, accordingly, disposed of.

CRA-D-968-2024

1. This appeal has been preferred challenging the order dated 14.06.2023 passed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge - I, Faridkot, dismissing the bail application filed by Manpreet Singh alias Lata (appellant), in FIR No. 228 dated 10.11.2022, Police Station City Kotkapura, in respect of offences punishable under Sections 302, 307, 148, 149, 120-B, 201, 473, 411, 212 IPC, Section 25 of Arms Act and Sections 16, 18 and 20 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967.

2. Learned counsel for the rival parties are heard.

3. It is submitted that charges in the case were framed on 28.11.2023. Involvement of the appellant, who was not earlier named in the FIR, primarily hinges upon his confessional statement, which led to recovery of blood stained shoes and cotton from the motor/tubewell area of the appellant.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that out of enlisted 105 prosecution witnesses, only 05 have been examined, and therefore, conclusion of trial may take long time.

5. Case of the appellant, who is in custody since 22.12.2022, is not much different than the case of his co-accused Swaran Singh alias Sunny, whose similar appeal (CRA-D-1225-2024) challenging dismissal of his bail application by the Court of learned Additional Sessions judge, Faridkot, was dismissed by this Court vide order dated 16.03.2026.

6. Considering the involvement of the appellant and gravity of the offence, this Court for the time being denies bail to the appellant. However,



liberty is extended that in case trial gets further delayed and the main prosecution witnesses are examined, the appellant can re-visit the Court.

7. Accordingly, the appeal stands dismissed.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

March 19, 2026
narotam

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

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