

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

CRM-M-28030-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 06.09.2016

Amandeep Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Krishan Singh Dadwal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab,
assisted by HC Baljeet Singh.

Mr. Bhanu Pratap, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.61 dated 29.06.2016, registered under Sections 323, 324, 341, 427, 326 and 148 read with Section 149 of the Indian Penal Code, (for short, 'the IPC') at Police Station Bullowal, Distt. Hoshiarpur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that it is a case of version and cross-version. The complainant side is the aggressor party. Section 326 IPC has been added subsequently. Petitioner No.1 suffered incised wound on the arm.

On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that three

NTIL SEETHI
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
Chandigarh

persons from the complainant side suffered as many as fourteen injuries. Petitioner No.1 has been attributed injury No.2, i.e. datar blow on the right leg below knee of Lovedeep Singh, which attracts Sections 326 IPC. In all, Lovedeep Singh suffered six injuries including one on the head. Similarly, petitioner No.2 has been attributed two incised wounds on the person of injured Gurdeep Singh, including injury on the head. Petitioner No.3 is attributed injury No.4, i.e. datar blow on the head of injured Gurdeep Singh, who suffered total seven injuries.

Heard.

The gun shot injury as asserted in the petition is not reflected in the DDR recorded at the instance of the petitioners. However, keeping in view the number, nature and seat of injuries attributed to the petitioners, no case for grant of pre-arrest bail is made out.

Dismissed.

However, nothing noticed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court, in the merits of the case.

06.09.2016
atulsethi

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No