

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

**Crl. Misc. No.M- 32585 of 2015  
Date of decision : 14.12.2015**

**Karandeep @ Kaka and another**

**.....Petitioner(s)**

**Versus**

**State of Punjab**

**...Respondent(s)**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY**

Present: Mr. Arun Takhi, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. V.P.S. Sidhu, Asst. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. S.S. Hira, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

**ANITA CHAUDHRY, J.**

The petitioners are seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.113 dated 04.09.2015, registered under Sections 323, 324, 307, 506, 34 IPC, Police Station Mehtiana, District Hoshiarpur.

The petitioners were directed to join the investigation. They had join the investigation but recovery of the weapons was not effected.

The counsel for the petitioners states that there was no injury under Section 307 IPC and the opinion of the doctor is available as Annexure P-2 and all the injuries were simple in nature.

The counsel for the complainant opposes the prayer and urges that there was a incised wound measuring 10.8 cm x 2.6 cm over right parieto occipital region and the wound was bone deep and there was fresh bleeding and the doctor has given the opinion that the injury was simple in nature. It was urged that the second injury too is on the head and in the middle of the parieto occipital region inflicted by the second accused. It was urged that the reason for the attack is indicated in the FIR and the complainant used to stop them from eve teasing his relative and earlier a scuffle had taken place and finding the injured alone that evening, he was attacked and the concession of anticipatory bail should not be allowed to such persons and they are roaming freely and are threatening the complainant.

The State counsel states that the recovery of the weapon could not be effected as the petitioners had stated that they had destroyed them.

The petitioners have not co-operated in the investigation. Recovery of the weapons could not be effected. There was a scuffle earlier. The petitioners were engaging in eve teasing. The petitioners had intervened and was threatened and was attacked with a 'Dattar'. Two injuries are on the head. No case for anticipatory bail is made out.

The petition is dismissed.

14.12.2015  
sunil

**(ANITA CHAUDHRY)**  
**JUDGE**