

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CRA No. 214 of 2021**

- Amit Awasthi son of Ram Kishore Awasthi, aged about 30 years, R/o village Nayapara, Khurd, Police Station Pithora, District Mahasamund (C.G.)

---- Appellant**Versus**

- State of Chhattisgarh, Through : The Station House Officer, Police Station Pithora, District Mahasamund (C.G.)

---- Respondent

For Appellant	:	Mr. T.K. Jha, Advocate
For Respondent	:	Mr. Devesh Verma, G.A.
For Objector	:	Mr. J.K. Gupta, Advocate

Hon'ble Smt Justice Rajani Dubey**Order on Board****31/03/2021**

1. The appellant has preferred this criminal appeal under Section 14(A) of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 for grant of anticipatory bail, as he apprehends his arrest in connection with Crime No.291/2020, registered at Police Station - Pithora, District Mahasamund (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 376, 376 (2) (n) IPC and Section 3(2)(V) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocity), Act, 1989 (for short 'the Act 1989') (as amended Act No.1/2016).
2. The prosecution story, according to FIR is that, the complainant/prosecutrix and the applicant are posted in same department and same office. They were in love with each other prior to seven years. The appellant

committed sexual intercourse with her on the pretext of marriage and when the applicant refused to marry her, she lodged the FIR on 28.11.2020.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. He further submits that even if the entire story, as stated in the FIR and the case diary statement, is taken as it is, there is absolutely no element that the appellant acted in such manner because of only she belongs to the reserved category. He also submits that the offence under the Act 1989 has been added only on the ground that the complainant belong to scheduled category. In support of his submission, learned counsel placed reliance on the decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Hitesh Verma Vs. State of Uttarakhand & Anr. (Criminal Appeal No.707/2020 arising out of SLP (Criminal) No.3585/2020)** and **Maheshwar Tigga Vs. State of Jharkhand (Criminal Appeal No.635/2020 arising out of S.L.P. (Cri) No.393/2020)**.
4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposed the bail application.
5. Mr. J.K. Gupta, learned counsel for the Objector opposing the bail application strenuously argued that the applicant refused to marry the prosecutrix only on the ground of her being the member of Scheduled Caste.
6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the matter of **Maheshwar** (supra), held that the prosecutrix willingly consented to having sexual intercourse with the appellant with whom she was deeply in love, not because he promised to marry her, but because she also

desired it. In these circumstances, it would be very difficult to impute to the appellant knowledge that the prosecutrix had consented in consequence of a misconception of fact arising from his promise. In any event, it was not possible for the appellant to know what was in the mind of the prosecutrix when she consented, because there were more reasons than one for her to consent.

8. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Hitesh** (supra), in para 18, held that offence under the Act is not established merely on the fact that the informant is a member of Scheduled Caste unless there is an intention to humiliate a member of Scheduled Caste or Scheduled Tribe for the reason that the victim belongs to such caste. In the present case, the parties are litigating over possession of the land. The allegation of hurling of abuses is against a person who claims title over the property. If such person happens to be a Scheduled Caste, the offence under Section 3(1)(r) of the Act is not made out.
9. After hearing counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, and in view of the judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Maheshwar** (supra) and **Hitesh** (supra), this Court is of the considered opinion that it is a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the appellant. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed. It is directed that in the event of arrest of the appellant in connection with aforesaid crime number, he shall be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety for the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned arresting/investigating officer or the court concerned, as the case may be, with the following terms and conditions:

- (i) that the appellant shall make himself available for interrogation/medical examination before the concerned investigating officer as and when required;
- (ii) that the appellant shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;
- (iii) that the appellant shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial; and
- (iv) that the appellant shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

Sd/-
(Rajani Dubey)
Judge