



121+205 (2 cases)

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

1. CRM-M-62847-2025

Lovedeep Singh @ Lovepreet Singh @ Lovejeet Singh @ Lavi Mann

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

2. CRM-M-10897-2026

Sujal

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

Date of decision : 19.03.2026

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Randeep Singh Waraich (Rana), Advocate
in CRM-M-62847-2025 and
Mr. Manuj Nagrath, Advocate in CRM-M-10897-2026
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. By way of this common order, this Court intend to dispose of
abovesaid two petitions as they have arisen out of the same FIR.

2. Petitioners have approached this Court by way of present
petitions praying for granting them regular bail in case FIR No.173 dated
27.07.2024, under Sections 309(4), 311, 317(2) of BNS and Sections 25, 27,
54 & 59 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Samrala, Police District
Khanna, Ludhiana.



3. As per the facts of the present case, the present FIR has been registered on the statement of Lakhveer Singh. It was alleged that on 27.07.2024, when he was present at Petrol Pump near Big Resort Lalodi Kalan Khanna Samrala Road, where he was working since 03 years, at around 1:55 pm, one Swift grey coloured car and one Pulsar motorcycle came there, in which Lovejeet Singh @ Lavi Mann (petitioner in CRM-M-62847-2025), Krishna Sahni, Jatin Moonga and Ajay Singh Rathi, were sitting and two persons were on the motorcycle. It was further alleged that Krishna Sahni asked for Rs.500/- worth of petrol and upon payment being delayed, co-accused Jatin Moonga pointed a pistol and threatened the complainant and in the meanwhile, Krishna Sahni snatched the money bag from the complainant and ran away on their respective vehicles along with the weapon. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. Petitioner-Lovejeet Singh @ Lavi Mann, was arrested on 02.08.2024. During investigation, complicity of Petitioner-Sujal (in CRM-M-10897-2026) surfaced and thus, he was arrested on 17.08.2024. Petitioners approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same were declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide orders dated 03.01.2025 and 01.10.2025, respectively. Aggrieved by the same, Petitioner-Lovedeep Singh earlier approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-18812-2025, however, same was dismissed as withdrawn on 21.04.2025. Hence, he is before this Court by way of filing of present second petition. However, *qua* petitioner-Sujal, this is the first petition praying for grant of bail.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners have vehemently

contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present



case. It is submitted that on the very same day, both the petitioners were roped in 02 different FIRs i.e. FIR No.173 dated 27.07.2024 i.e. the present FIR and FIR No.155 dated 27.07.2024. It is contended that petitioner-Lovedeep Singh @ Lovepreet Singh has already been granted bail in FIR No.155 dated 27.07.2024 vide order dated 17.02.2026, passed by this Court. It is submitted that even otherwise the allegations regarding firing and committing robbery/dacoity are against the co-accused and not against the petitioners. It is submitted that even otherwise, petitioner-Sujal is not named in the FIR and has been implicated in the present FIR only on the basis of supplementary statement recorded after a delay of 05 days. It is submitted that petitioners have no criminal antecedents, as the only other FIR is of the same day. It is submitted that the material witnesses already stand examined and thus, there is no probability of the petitioners tampering with the prosecution witnesses. It is thus, submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the case, petitioners deserve to be granted bail.

5. Learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioners and submits that the petitioners are habitual in committing such offences. He submits that on the very same day, the petitioners committed 02 grievous offences. However, he on instructions, has submitted that out of 10 prosecution witnesses, 05 witnesses have been examined, 03 witnesses given up and only 02 witnesses remain to be examined. He has produced the custody certificates of the petitioners on record.

6. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioners are accused in 02 different incidents occurred on 27.07.2024. Petitioner-Lovedeep Singh @ Lovepreet Singh

has already been granted regular bail in another FIR i.e. FIR No.155 dated



27.07.2024 by this Court vide order dated 17.02.2026, passed in CRM-M-63318-2025. Petitioner-Sujal, as contended before this Court, was not even named in the FIR and was arrayed as an accused on the basis of supplementary statement. Material witnesses already stand examined. As per custody certificate, petitioner-Lovedeep Singh @ Lovepreet Singh @ Lovi has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 06 months and 26 days as on 18.03.2026. It further reflects that he is involved in one more case, however, he is on bail in the said case.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

8. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, both the petitions are allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their 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.

9. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by petitioner-Sujal during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

19.03.2026

ps-I

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

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