



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

CRM-M-63318-2025

Date of decision : 17.02.2026

**Lovedeep Singh @ Lovepreet Singh @ Lovejeet Singh @ Lavi Mann
.....Petitioner**

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Senior Advocate with
Mr. L.S. Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, DAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing the present second petition praying for grant of regular bail to him in case FIR No.155 dated 27.07.2024, under Sections 109, 351(2), 191(3), 190 of IPC, 1860 and Sections 25, 54, 59 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Sadar Khanna, District Ludhiana.

2. Succinctly facts of the case are that the FIR was lodged on the statement of complainant-Manveer Singh. It was alleged that on 27.07.2024 at about 1:30 PM, he along with his friends namely, Harvinder Singh and Gurvinder Singh were coming back after playing volleyball from the college ground. When they reached near the water tap, then Ajay Singh and Jatin Monga @ Trendy found standing. They started commenting on them. On raising objection, Jatin Monga @ Trendy took out a pistol from his pocket and started firing at him with intention to kill. He tried to escape then one fire hit on his left bicep. Due to the firing in the college, a commotion took place and one fire hit college peon namely, Husan Lal, who also got seriously injured. It was alleged that the assailants had a car and



later on, he came to know that Lovepreet Singh @ Lavi (petitioner) was also sitting in the car. Request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. Petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing counsel for the parties, learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana dismissed the same vide order dated 04.01.2025. Thereafter, petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-18787-2025 however, the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 29.07.2025. Hence, being aggrieved, petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present second petition.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in this case. He submits that as per the case of the prosecution, the allegations regarding firing are *qua* co-accused. He has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely roped in the present case on the allegations that he was sitting in the car. He submits that admittedly, there is no other allegation against the petitioner. He submits that neither there is any allegation against the petitioner that he was armed with any weapon nor any overt act having been committed by him. He submits that the petitioner is behind the bars from last about 1½ years. He submits on the very same day, petitioner was involved in another FIR as well. He submits that the prosecution has not been able to examine even a single witness till date and thus, his incarceration is prolonged.

4. Learned State counsel however, has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner was part of the unlawful assembly. He submits that the petitioner was present along with the co-accused who fired, in the college and the



complainant and one college peon namely, Husan Lal got seriously injured. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of 19 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was alleged to be the part of the unlawful assembly. The allegations regarding firing was qua the co-accused not against the petitioner. Custody certificate filed by the State shows that the petitioner has undergone incarceration of 01 years 06 months and 10 days as on 16.02.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in one more case and he is not on bail in that case.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

7. If the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

17.02.2026
m.sharma

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

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