



**214/2 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Date of decision:21.05.2025

(i) CRM-M-26410-2025

Mohammad Kaif ...Petitioner

VS.

State of Punjab ...Respondent

(ii) CRM-M-27117-2025

Shehzad Khan and another ...Petitioners

VS.

State of Punjab ...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Abdul Aziz, Advocate
for the petitioners (in both petitions).

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J.(oral)

1. This order shall dispose off above-said two petitions i.e. CRM-M-26410-2025, titled as Mohammad Kaif Vs. State of Punjab and CRM-M-27117-2025 titled as Shehzad Khan and another Vs. State of Punjab, whereby the petitioners have prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to them in case FIR No.14 dated 16.02.2024 registered under Sections 324, 323, 506, 34 of IPC (326 of IPC added later on), at Police Station City-1, Malerkotla.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that as per the



allegations levelled by the complainant, they had given fist blows to the complainant and no other injury has been attributed to them. Even the medical record in the present case does not advance the case of the prosecution in any manner as the complainant/injured had suffered two injuries only. Even injury No.1, which attracted the offence under Section 326 of IPC, has been allegedly caused by Amzad Khan, co-accused and he has already been arrested by the police. Learned counsel further contends that even the petitioners were not present at the place of occurrence and the complainant has wrongly mentioned their names in the FIR, which was registered after three days of delay.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioners and they do not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

5. In the present case, the petitioners are attributed the injuries by fist blows and no weapon was used by them in the alleged occurrence. Moreover, injury, which lead to addition of offence under Section 326 IPC, is attributed to Amzad Khan, who has already been arrested in the present case. Thus, in the considered opinion of the Court, the custodial interrogation of the petitioners would not be required.

6. Without commenting any further on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioners are granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of



the BNSS. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioners to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and they shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

		(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
		JUDGE
21.05.2025	Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes/No
hemlata	Whether reportable :	Yes/No