



**209**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT**  
**CHANDIGARH**

**CRA-S-293-2024 (O&M)**  
**Date of Decision:07.04.2025**

**Sonu Gupta**

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

**State of Haryana and another**

.....Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present: Mr.Gaurav Vir Singh Behl, Legal Aid Counsel, and  
Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate, for the appellant..

Mr. Surinder Kumar Dagar, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rajeev Kewatra, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)**

1. The present appeal has been filed for setting aside the order dated 21.12.2023 passed by the learned Special Court/Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal vide which the application filed by the appellant for grant of anticipatory bail was dismissed.

2. Mr.Gaurav Vir Singh Behl, learned Legal Aid Counsel and Mr. Sandeep Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant submitted that the dispute in the present case is a matrimonial dispute between the parties and the appellant and respondent No.2 are already married to each other. They submitted that the learned trial Court had dismissed the bail application on the ground of Section 18 of the SC & ST Act but in the present case, the same would not be applicable because it was a case where the allegations were pertaining to a statement which was not made in front of any third person or publicly and therefore, the bar of



Sections 18 and 18-A of the SC & ST Act will not be applicable. They also submitted that in pursuance of the order passed by this Court on 22.02.2024, the appellant has already joined investigation and he has cooperated with the investigation process.

3. Mr. Surinder Kumar Dagar, DAG, Haryana has submitted that he has sought instructions to state that in pursuance of the orders passed by this Court on 22.02.2024, the appellant has already joined investigation and he is fully cooperating with the investigation process and he is not required for custodial interrogation. He also submitted that the allegations were not pertaining to a statement which was made in front of third person or publicly.

4. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties, this Court is of the considered view that since the allegations were not pertaining to imputation casted in public, the bar of Sections 18 and 18-A of the SC & ST Act will not apply in the present case. So far as the prayer made by the appellant for grant of anticipatory bail is concerned, as per learned State counsel, the appellant has also joined investigation and he has cooperated with the investigation process and he is not required for custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present appeal is allowed. The impugned order dated 21.12.2023 passed by the learned Special Court/Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal is hereby set aside. The order dated 22.02.2024 is hereby made absolute.

**07.04.2025**

*rakesh*

**(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No