

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

2025:PHHC:097156



291

**CRA-S-1932-2025 (O&M)**  
**Date of Decision: 31.07.2025.**

Ramprasad

...Appellant.

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents.

\*\*\*

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR**

.....

Present: Mr. Jitender Dhanda, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. R.K. Singla, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

\*\*\*

**SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. (Oral)**

Appellant has filed appeal against impugned order dated 22.02.2025 passed by Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, vide which his anticipatory bail application in FIR No.234 dated 30.03.2025, under Sections 115, 191(2), 193(2), 296, 324(6), 333, 351(3) of BNS, Section 25 of Arms Act and Sections 3(1)(r) & (s), 3(2) (va) of SC/ST, Act, registered at Police Station Sadar, Hisar, has been dismissed.

Learned counsel for the appellant has contended that false facts have been narrated in the FIR and the appellant has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submitted that the appellant did not utter any caste based remarks to the complainant and essential ingredient of public view is also missing. Learned counsel for the appellant has further submitted that the appellant is ready and willing to join the investigation. The impugned order is based upon conjectures and surmises and is liable to be set aside.

Learned counsel representing the State opposed the bail application while contending that the present appellant barged in the house of the complainant and abused her in the name of her caste. He further argued that even if it is believed that core ingredient of 'public view' of Section 3(1) (r) & (s) of SC/ST Act is missing still the anticipatory bail application is not maintainable as Section 3(2) (va) of SC/ST Act has also been attracted and therefore, rigor of Section 18, 18-A of SC/ST Act would apply. Moreover, the recovery is to be effected from the appellant and for that purpose custodial interrogation of the appellant was required to complete the investigation, so prayer for the anticipatory bail had been rightly declined by the trial Court.

I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record carefully.

Only vague and general allegations have been levelled against the appellant regarding abusing by caste. No specific words have been quoted that are attributed to the appellant. Vide order dated 09.06.2025, the appellant was released on interim bail, subject to joining the investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Ramesh Kumar, has apprised the Court that in compliance of order dated 09.06.2025 passed by this Court, the appellant had joined the investigation before the Investigating Officer and had co-operated with the Investigating Officer at the time of joining the investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

Considering the aforesaid facts, the anticipatory bail application filed by the appellant was wrongly rejected by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar by passing the impugned order dated

22.02.2025. Appellant is ready to join the investigation as and when required. Therefore, appeal preferred by the appellant is allowed and the relief, as extended to the appellant by this Court vide order dated 09.06.2025, is hereby made absolute.

However, the appellant shall continue to join the investigation as and when required/ called upon to do so and shall also strictly abide by all the conditions as laid down in Section 482(2) BNSS.

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)  
JUDGE

31.07.2025.

*Komal*

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