



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

235

CRM-M-36524-2025
Decided on : 17.09.2025

Lovedeep Singh @ Labhi . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Jashandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Lovedeep Singh @ Labhi	67	07.04.2025	111 of BNS, 2023	Talwandi Sabo	Bathinda

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the present FIR has been registered solely on the basis of alleged secret information, without there being any actual incident or direct involvement of the petitioner. It is argued that the only allegation against the petitioner is that he was dealing in intoxicating products along with other named accused persons.

Besides, there are allegations of involvement in crimes committed with deadly weapons. As per FIR, on the alleged date of incident,



all the accused persons, namely Lovedeep Singh @ Labhi, Polas, Resham Singh @ Reshu, and Lovedeep Singh @ Labhi (petitioner herein), were purportedly in the process of looting passers-by with deadly weapons.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner was not apprehended from the spot, and after his arrest, nothing has been shown to be recovered from his possession. It is, therefore, argued that the petitioner cannot be treated as an accused involved in any organized crime with deadly weapons, nor can the offences relating to organized crime be said to be attracted against him.

It is further submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 07.04.2025, i.e., for more than five months, and the investigation already stands concluded with filing of the challan before the trial Court. Hence, further incarceration of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose for the prosecution.

Besides, co-accused 'Kala Singh' has already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 07.07.2025, passed in CRM-M-29343-2025, titled "*Kala Singh v. State of Punjab*", from whose possession even a *danda* (stick) was allegedly recovered. Thus, the case of the present petitioner stands on a better footing than that of co-accused Kala Singh. Accordingly, in view of the above and by claiming parity, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 16.09.2025, in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.



5. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, refers to the status report and submits that the petitioner is also involved in several other cases under different penal provisions, including one under the NDPS Act, though all such cases are still pending trial, which reflects his criminal antecedents. Therefore, he does not deserve the concession of bail.

However, upon being queried by this Court, learned State counsel fairly concedes that the process of recording the statements of prosecution witnesses has not yet commenced and, at this stage, he is not in a position to specifically controvert the factual submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner.

6. On hearing learned counsel for the respective parties and perusing the material available on record, this Court finds it appropriate to consider the issue of personal liberty of the petitioner, particularly when the applicability of Section 111 of the BNS, 2023, is yet to be established by the prosecution through unimpeachable and admissible evidence. Although the petitioner is stated to be facing trial in some other cases, mere pendency of such proceedings cannot be taken as a ground to deny bail in the present matter, in the absence of any conviction. It is also relevant that co-accused of the petitioner, namely Kala Singh, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court.

7. Consequently, without making any comments over the merits of the case, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any



threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made here-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

10. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 17, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No