

2026.PHHC.028857



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-58972-2025

Lovedeep Singh @ Babu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	19.02.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	24.02.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	24.02.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Amrinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The instant one is the second petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 131 dated 27.06.2024 registered under Section 302 read with Section 34 of IPC, at Police Station Sadar, Nabha, District Patiala. His previous petition bearing CRM-M-48996-2024 had been dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 04.10.2024.

2026.PHHC.028857



2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Nirbhay Singh @ Kala on 27.06.2024, alleging that on the evening of 26.06.2024, his son Karanveer Singh along with his partner Raman Singh @ Sanju and one Sahil Khan, had gone to fair of Mata Sitla Mandir at village Kot Kalan, for taking blessings. They did not return till late night. Then on receipt of information that his son Karanbir had been beaten up by some persons, he along with his younger son Vikram Singh rushed towards village Kot Kalan and came to know that the present petitioner by forming an unlawful assembly with the co-accused had opened an assault upon his son and had caused injuries to him with their respective weapons and his son had succumbed to the injuries. The petitioner and co-accused had fled from the spot. The motive attributed to the assailants was that Raman Singh, partner of the victim, used to converse with sister of accused Sukhpreet Singh @ Bobby, due to which he was offended with the victim as well as Raman Singh. The petitioner along with the co-accused Jugraj Singh and Sukhpreet Singh, was arrested on 29.06.2024. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and got recovered the *kirch* used in the incident as well as the clothing worn by him at the time of the occurrence. Other accused were also arrested. investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The co-accused who have been found to be juvenile in conflict with law, have been extended benefit of bail. All the

2026.PHHC.028857



material witnesses have turned hostile. He has clean antecedents. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. No specific overt act has been attributed to him. A false recovery has been planted upon him. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner, who in connivance with the co-accused, had inflicted injuries on the person of the victim thereby causing his homicidal death. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner has placed on record Annexure P-6 and P-7 copies of sworn depositions of eye-witnesses Raman @ Sanju and Sahil and Annexure P-5 copy of testimony of Nirbhai Singh @ Kala. On perusal of their statements, it is revealed that neither of them had identified the petitioner as one of the assailants of the son of the complainant. Rather they are shown to have totally resiled from the prosecution version and did not implicate the petitioner in the commission of subject offence. Even complainant has not deposed anything against the petitioner. The trial will take considerable time to conclude since substantive number of witnesses still remained to be examined. Taking into consideration the nature of the evidence, which has

2026.PHHC.028857



come on record in the form of testimonies of the material witnesses, who have not implicated the petitioner in commission of subject offences, the period spent by the petitioner in custody and the attendant facts and circumstances peculiar to the case, this Court is of considered opinion that no fruitful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial.

8. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

24th February, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |