



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

**CRM-M-31678-2025
Date of decision: 10.07.2025**

SAJIDA BEGUM ALIAS SAYEEDA ALIAS BHAPPI AND ANOTHER

...PETITIONERS

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Mohd. Salim, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in a case FIR No.32 dated 01.04.2025, registered under Sections 126(2), 221, 226, 262, 132, 351(2), 190 & 121 (1) of BNS Act, 2023, at Police Station Sandaur, District Malerkotla, Punjab.

2. On 05.06.2025, following order was passed:

“Prayer in the present petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in a case FIR No.32 dated 01.04.2025, registered under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 221, 226, 262, 132, 351(2), 190 & 121 (1) of BNS Act, 2023, at Police Station Sandaur, District Malerkotla, Punjab.

Learned counsel for the petitioners inter alia contends that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the FIR (supra), as HC Kuljinder Singh had grudge against them. It has also been contended by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners that similarly situated coaccused namely, Sadhra Begum @ Bheelo, Sabar Khan and Zahid Khan @ Zahid Ali @ Jahid



Khan, had approached this Court by filing petitions bearing CRM-M-24498 of 2025, CRM-M-25446-2025 and CRM-M-29485-2025 respectively, seeking anticipatory bail and they have been granted interim anticipatory bail. Moreover, the maximum sentence provided for the offences, under which the FIR (supra) is registered, is punishable upto 05 years and no notice under Section 35(3) of BNSS (erstwhile Section 41-A of Cr.P.C.) has been issued to the petitioners.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Ms. Navreet K Barnala, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State and waives service.

In the meantime, keeping in view the law enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI (2022) 10 SCC 51; Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and others 2010 SCC OnLine SC 137; Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia etc. Vs. State of Punjab (1980) 2 SCC 565, Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar (2014) 8 SCC 273 and Sushila Aggarwal Vs. State of NCT Delhi 2020 (1) RCR (Criminal) 833, at the first instance, the petitioners are directed to appear before the Investigating Officer within a period of two weeks from today and thereafter as directed by the Investigating Officer. In the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing bail/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Investigating/Arresting Officer. The petitioners shall cooperate with the Investigating/Arresting Officer and abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 (erstwhile Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.)

Adjourned to 10.07.2025.

If the Investigating/Arresting Officer does not permit the petitioners to join the investigation, the petitioners would appear before the Illaqa Magistrate, who would then summon the Investigating/Arresting Officer and direct him to join the petitioners in investigation, in terms of the order of this Court.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to



be an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.”

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Dilbar Khan, submits that in compliance of order dated 05.06.2025 passed by this Court, the petitioners have joined the investigation and are not required for further custodial interrogation.

4. Keeping in view the statement made by learned State Counsel, the order dated 05.06.2025, is made absolute. The petitioners shall abide by the terms and conditions enumerated in Section 482(2) BNSS, 2023 (*Erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.*)

5. The petition is accordingly disposed of.

6. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

July 10, 2025
manisha

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |