



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-10614-2025 (O&M)

Decided on : 26.03.2025

Mohd. Jameen and others

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Parvez Akhtar Dhaliwal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Raageshwari, Advocate for
Mr. Gaurav Vir Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. In the present anticipatory bail petition, on 24.02.2025,
following order was passed:-

“ Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 131 dated 12.12.2024, under Sections 115(2), 191(3), 190, 351(2), 333, 117(1) and 117(2) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Sadar Ahmedgarh.

By producing the copy of the order dated 10.02.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Malerkotla (Duty), whereby co-accused-Mohammad Nadeem has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that stand of the investigating officer has been considered, wherein he conceded that as per CCTV footage, the incident did not take place inside the house, as alleged by the complainant in the FIR.

The copy of the order dated 10.02.2025 is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place with the paper-book.

Notice of motion.

On advance notice, Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab, appears on behalf of respondent/State.

Let status report be filed on or before the date fixed, after examining the complete CCTV footage of the incident.

List on 28.2.2025.”

2. In addition to this, learned counsel for the petitioners submits



that there is no specific role attributed to the petitioners, and if the place of occurrence is disputed or remains uncertain, the same would be subject matter of the trial. Thus, they deserve the concession of anticipatory bail, more for the reason that the petitioners are ready to join the investigation.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 25.03.2025, 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.

4. By referring to the status report, learned State counsel submits that though as per the CCTV footage, the incidence is found to be happened inside house, but the present petitioners, namely; Mohd. Jameen, Mohammad Aahid Khan and Lovepreet Singh, were present at the spot. However, it cannot be said definitely that any specific injury has been caused by the present petitioners.

He also points out that it is not disputed that except Section 333 of BNS, 2023, all other offences are bailable in nature.

5. I have considered the circumstances and gone through the instant petition and the status report, and thereupon, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Accordingly, petitioners are directed to join the investigation within a period of three weeks from today, or as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of their arrest, the petitioners shall be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioners shall also abide by all the conditions laid



down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7. Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their passports to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioners would seek prior permission of the Court.

8. Petition stands **disposed of** accordingly.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 26, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*