



220

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

CRA-S-1869-2025

Date of Decision:04.08.2025

Ranjit Singh

...Appellant

vs.

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Judgepreet Singh Warring, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The appellant has filed the present appeal under Section 14-A of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act') against the impugned order dated 12.05.2025, passed by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda in case DDR No.31 dated 25.07.2021 under Sections 323, 506, 34 of IPC, 1860, Sections 3 and 4 of SC and ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 in FIR No.86 dated 13.07.2021 under Sections 379, 411, 323, 506, 34 of IPC and Sections 3 and 4 of SC & ST Act, registered at Nahianwala, Bathinda, whereby the bail application filed by the appellant under Section 483 of BNSS was ordered to be dismissed.

2. In the present case, notice was issued to respondent No.2, however, despite service, there is no representation on behalf of respondent No.2/complainant in the present case. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by ASI Gurdit Singh, however,

the appellant was arrayed as an accused in the cross-version, which was registered after 12 days of the occurrence. He further contends that the appellant had earlier applied for grant of concession of anticipatory bail and vide order dated 31.08.2021 (Annexure A-3), he was granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court. Thereafter, the challan was presented, but due to some misunderstanding, the appellant could not appear before the trial Court and he was declared as proclaimed offender in the present case. However, he was re-arrested on 22.03.2025 and since then, he is in custody. Learned counsel further submits that in fact, the appellant is running a small Hotel at Bathinda and after getting the concession of bail, he had gone there. However, he was never informed by the police authorities with regard to the pendency of the present case.

3. On the other hand, status report by way of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Bhucho, District Bathinda has been filed by learned State counsel in Court today and the same is taken on record. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the appellant on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present appellant and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. In the present case, the appellant was earlier granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court, vide order dated 31.08.2021 (Annexure A-3). However, subsequently, he did not appear before the trial Court and was declared as proclaimed offender, but now he is in custody for the last more than

04 months and no witness has been examined so far. Thus, further custody of the appellant will not serve any meaningful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present appeal is allowed and the appellant is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

04.08.2025
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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