

15.7.2026

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Bijnor.
1- Anticipatory bail application no.2169/2026
2- Anticipatory bail application no.2198/2026

ORDER

The above noted both the first applications for anticipatory bail have been moved on behalf of accused-applicants **Muntazir, Saboor, Babloo @ Naseem Akhtar, Tazudeen, Abdul Ahmed @ Shanu, Abdul Mannan, Babar Malik and Mohd. Danish** in crime no.364/2026 u/ss: 333, 190, 191(2), 109(1), 115(2), 305A, 324(2) BNS P.S Chandpur, Bijnor.

Since above noted both the applications for anticipatory bail are interrelated hence are being decided jointly by this order.

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant-accused as well as learned DGC(Crl.) for the State and perused the case diary.

As per copy of FIR complainant lodged a report that on 13.6.2024 at about 11.20AM accused-persons named above alongwith 10-15 other persons, having armed with sharp edged weapon intruded into the house of complainant with intent to take forcible possession thereof. They caused injuries to his father Ibrahim, mother Musarrat, sister Sonam, brother Azeem and Jahageer and also stole five lac rupees cash and 140 gm golden ornaments and also caused damage to the DBR of CCTV camera.

It is alleged by the applicants-accused that they did not cause injury to the injured with intent to kill them and have been implicated falsely in this case.

Hon'ble High Court in case of **Iddu and 4 others Vs. State of U.P and two others while placing reliance on case law of Shivam Vs. State of U.P** has been pleased to hold that – The object of the legislature behind adding the provision of anticipatory bail was to safeguard a person against whom false accusation or charges have been made.

As per contents of FIR, the applicants-accused caused injuries to the injured in the form of contusion, lacerated wounds and abrasions alongwith fracture of upper end ulna of right forearm and fracture of lower end ulna of left forearm. It is also alleged that the accused-applicants alongwith co-accused persons caused grievous injuries to the injured on different parts of their body with intention to kill them., It is also alleged that in this matter the recovery of weapons which were used in the incident in question, are to be made from the possession of applicants-accused. Moreover, Accused-applicants are named in FIR and as per contents of FIR a cognizable offence is made out against the accused-

2

applicants. In such cases, no accused should be granted anticipatory bail.

In view of above, this application for anticipatory bail of accused-applicant is rejected.

A copy of this order be placed on connected anticipatory bail application.

**Sessions Judge,
Bijnor.
15.07.2026**