



104

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

**CRM-M-7362-2025 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 04.03.2025**

ALI KHAN

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Himanshu Puri, Advocate, and
Mr. Sunny Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Shiv K. Sharma, Advocate, and
Mr. Kartik Gandhi, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

CRM-8255-2025

1. Present application has been moved by the applicant/complainant for impleading him as respondent No.2 in the present petition.
2. Considering the averments mentioned in the application, prayer made therein is allowed, and the applicant/complainant is ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2 in the present petition. Amended memo of parties is taken on record.
3. CM stands disposed of.

CRM-M-7362-2025

1. In the present anticipatory bail petition, on 19.02.2025, following order was passed:-

“1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Ali Khan, Aged about 22 years	135	10.12.2024	331(6), 115(2), 324(4), 351(2) of BNS, 2023	City-II Malerkotla	Malerkotla

2. Contention is that the complainant Subhan Ali and all other accused namely; Ali and Ashu Malik @ Asif, were friends since past and as per the admitted fact in the FIR, both the accused used to come to his shop earlier also.

He further submits that joint role assigned to the accused is that complainant was given a blow with base-bat on his head, and there is one injury only, which is simple in nature. Thus, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On advance notice, learned State counsel puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to respond to the submissions addressed by learned counsel opposite, after seeking instructions, and, in case of necessity, to file status report.

5. Adjourned to 27.02.2025.

6. Learned State counsel is directed to file status report with the details of the number and nature of injuries and the damage caused by the accused persons in the shop.

7. Meanwhile, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed till next date of hearing.

To be shown in the urgent list.”

2. Again, on 27.02.2025, following order was passed:-

“As per conversation placed on record, the petitioner has threatened, though the said fact is disputed by the non-applicant.

After going through the call details and the alleged facts in the FIR that the complainant was given a blow with base-ball bat/wooden slugger on his head and other articles in the shop were also damaged including the glass door, hearing of the present petition is postponed to 04.03.2025.

To be shown in the Urgent List.”

3. It is noticed that in the present case, incident took place inside the shop of the complainant at around 10.00 P.M. Although, the

injury was opined to be simple, it was inflicted with a baseball bat to the right side of the complainant's forehead. Additionally, some other articles in the shop were also damaged during the incident.

4. Based on the photographs attached to the application i.e. CRM-8255-2025 filed by the complainant, along with the transcription of audio calls between the complainant and the petitioner on 13.12.2024 (counsel for the complainant submits that the date has been incorrectly typed as 22.02.2025 in Annexure A-3), this Court finds no substantial reason to grant the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, as the conduct displayed is highly condemnable.

Furthermore, on the previous date of hearing, the petitioner was given an opportunity to compensate the complainant for the loss caused. However, as per the counsel for the petitioner appearing today, the petitioner has outrightly denied any intention to compensate the complainant.

5. With the reasons recorded here above, present petition is **dismissed.**

04.03.2025

Lavisha

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*

Whether reportable *Yes/No*