

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

**Crl. Misc. No. M-6287 of 2016**

**Date of decision : 10.05.2016**

Ravi and others

... Petitioners

versus

Sharda

... Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY**

Present: Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate  
for the petitioner

Mr. Rakesh Dhiman, Advocate  
for the respondent

**ANITA CHAUDHRY, J. (ORAL)**

The petitioners are seeking anticipatory bail in a complaint case bearing No. 160 dated 01.10.2012 under Sections 323, 354, 506, 34 IPC and Section 3 of SC & ST Act.

A complaint had been filed in which petitioners had been summoned under Sections 323, 354, 506 and 34 IPC and they had put in appearance. The complainant thereafter preferred a revision and now the accused have been summoned under Section 3 and 4 of the SC & ST Act and application filed by the petitioners for anticipatory bail had been dismissed.

Vide order dated 23.02.2016, the petitioners were directed to appear before the Court below within a week. They had put in appearance. Copy of the order dated 01.03.2016 has been placed on record and the requisite bonds have also been furnished.

Learned counsel for the respondent states that application for anticipatory bail is not maintainable.

The trial Court did not find a fit case for summoning the accused under Sections 3 and 4 of the SC & ST Act. It is a question which will have to be examined by the trial Court.

Since the petitioners have appeared before the Court below and admitted to interim bail, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 23.02.2016 is hereby made absolute subject to the condition that the petitioners will comply with the conditions contained in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

**May 10, 2016**  
reena

**(ANITA CHAUDHARY)**  
**JUDGE**