

2025:PHHC:088291



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

**CRA-S-2142-2025
Date of Decision: 18.07.2025**

Gurmeet Kaur Goni @ Gurmeet Kaur ... Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab and another ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Vikas Bali, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ravinder Gill, Advocate
for respondent No.2 (complainant)

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Appellant has approached this Court by way of present appeal praying for granting regular bail in case FIR No.59 dated 28.05.2025 under Sections 115(2), 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 and Sections 3(1) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, registered at Police Station Lohian, District Jalandhar Rural.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR has been lodged on the basis of the statement of the complainant Gurpreet Doddhar @ Yama. The appellant along with co-accused had been alleged to have passed the casteist remarks and co-accused also caused injuries to the complainant. On registration of the FIR, the investigation was commenced. The appellant was arrested on 21.06.2025. Aggrieved from the same, the appellant approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar praying for grant of regular bail.

However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the appellant vide order dated 02.07.2025. Hence, the appellant has approached this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing the present appeal.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the appellant that the appellant has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He submits that the complainant is *Sarpanch* of the village and the appellant also belongs to the same village. Due to some misunderstanding between both the sides, the present FIR has been lodged. He submits that both the sides with the intervention of the respectables have already resolved their petty dispute to live in harmony in the village. He submits that on the basis of the compromise arrived, some of the co-accused have already been granted anticipatory bail. He submits that in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the appellant deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has fairly submitted that both the sides have resolved their issues and thus, he has affirmed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the appellant.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the appellant. He submits that specific allegations have been made against the appellant and the case is under investigation. On instructions, he submits that appellant has no criminal antecedents. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the appellant.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the appellant and the complainant belong to the same village. As submitted before this Court, both the sides have amicably resolved their *inter se* dispute by way of compromise. As per custody certificate, the

appellant has no criminal antecedents. The co-accused have already been granted concession of anticipatory bail.

7. The veracity of the allegations and counter allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the appellant succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the appellant.

8. Accordingly, the present appeal is allowed and the appellant is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

18.07.2025

Parveen kumar

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No

Whether reportable :Yes/No