



CRM-M-69 of 2026

-1-

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

213

CRM-M-69 of 2026
Date of Decision: 10.03.2026

Lovepreet Singh @ Lavi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Damanjeet Bhoriwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amritpal Singh, DAG, Punjab.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.96 dated 26.06.2025 registered under Sections 331(4), 305 and 111 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station Maur, District Bathinda.
2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner along with other co-accused, had committed theft of parts of a mobile tower. Hence, the present FIR.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the alleged offence. He further submitted that neither the petitioner was present on the spot on the alleged date nor he has any

**CRM-M-69 of 2026****-2-**

knowledge about the said incident. He further argued that there is no eye-witness of the alleged incident and the FIR is lodged merely on the basis of hearsay version of the complainant who has falsely involved the petitioner in the present case in collusion with local police. The petitioner is in custody since 12.08.2025. The investigation in this case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have also been framed. He further submitted that there are total 16 prosecution witnesses but none has been examined till date and as such, the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel, who has appeared on advance notice of the petition, has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. He argued that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and has actively participated in the crime. He has further submitted that the petitioner is involved in multiple other cases meaning thereby he is a habitual offender.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 06 months; investigation is complete; challan stands presented; charges framed; out of 16 witnesses, none has been examined till date; the complicity of the petitioner is a matter of trial; the trial is proceeding at snail's pace, and will take a long time to conclude. Thus, no



CRM-M-69 of 2026

-3-

useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. His continued detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle "*bail is a rule*" and "*jail is an exception*".

8. As regards the submission of learned State counsel that petitioner is involved in other/one more criminal case(s), reference is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (2) SCC 382*** in which, it is held that the facts and circumstances of the present case are to be seen while deciding a bail application and the bail application of the petitioner cannot be rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in other/another case(s). The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced herein-below:-

"As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away

**CRM-M-69 of 2026****-4-**

from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

9. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10.03.2026*D.Bansal*

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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