

202

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

CRM-M No.44492 of 2017

Date of Decision: 18.04.2018

Barinder Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Vs

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. A.S. Brar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. B.S. Bairagi, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

On 28.11.2017, following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioners states that in discharge of their official duties, the petitioners were on patrolling. The offence under Section 3 and 4 of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 is not attracted as petitioners were not conversant with the caste of the complainant. It is only in the order dated 07.11.2017 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga, it was mentioned that the petitioners called the complainant as ‘Chuhra’.

Notice of motion for 19.01.2018.

Meanwhile, in case the petitioners appear before

the trial Court within a week from today, they shall be admitted on bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.”

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that though the petitioners were summoned for the offences under Sections 323, 324, 295-A IPC and Sections 3, 4 of the S.C/S.T Act, but the charges have been framed only for the offences under Sections 323, 295-A IPC.

Petitioners have already appeared before the trial Court and have been admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

In view of aforesaid, without commenting upon the merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to make the order dated 28.11.2017 as absolute. Ordered accordingly.

Petition stands disposed of.

April 18, 2018

Prince

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No