



CRM-M-46457-2024 and
CRM-M-57430-2025 1
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

106 CRM-M-46457-2024

OmkarPetitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent
106-2 CRM-M-57430-2025

AshikPetitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

Decided on: 27.01.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Harjeet Singh Sandrania, Advocate
for the petitioner
(in CRM-M-46457-2024)

Mr. Kulwinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner
(in CRM-M-57430-2025)

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.(Oral)

1. By way of this common order, the aforementioned petitions are being disposed of together, as they arise out of one common FIR.
2. Present petitions have been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, seeking anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No. 21 dated 29.01.2024, registered under Sections 302, 323, 148, and 149 of the IPC at Police Station Boha, District Mansa.
3. As per the allegations, petitioner-Omkar allegedly delivered a *soti* blow to deceased-Kabira. Petitioner-Aashik is alleged to have delivered a *soti* blow to the head of the deceased Kabira, while co-accused Gurmuk Singh and Bugga Singh are alleged to have stated that

CRM-M-46457-2024 and
CRM-M-57430-20252

the deceased should not be spared and should be killed by giving *soti* blows. As per post mortem report following injuries were noticed, which reads as under:

Examination of External Injuries			
Sr. No.	Injuries	Marked	Injury Number
1.	2 CM Sutured wound present on right neck region. On further dissection subcutaneous infiltration of blood present.	Yes	2
2.	7 CM sutured wound preset on right iliac region of abdomen with cranial bone insitu	Yes	3
3.	20 CM sutured wound present extending from right temporal to left temporal region(status post craniotomy) on further dissection heamtoma present in right temporal and parietal region, underlying brain tissue was contused.	Yes	1

The cause of death give by doctor is as under:

“ After going through autopsy findings and Bhatia Hospital record I am of the opinion that cause of death in this case is sequelae of Headd Injury and its complications which is ante-mortem in nature and sufficient to cause death in ordinary course of nature.”

4. Learned State counsel points out that the complainant, Pakia, wife of the deceased, has fully supported the version of the prosecution. In view of this, no ground is made out for interference, and the present petitions are hereby dismissed.
5. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected cases.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

January 27, 2026
Rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO