

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

**Sr.No.101**

**CRM-M No.28756 of 2021**

**Date of Decision: 26.07.2021**

Rana Ranjit

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

***(Heard through Video-Conferencing)***

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present: Mr. Surinder Thakur, Advocate for the petitioner.

\* \* \* \*

**MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)**

The petitioner herein seeks the relief of anticipatory bail in the criminal case arising out of the FIR bearing No.126 dated 22.06.2021 registered at Police Station Hariana, District Hoshiarpur, under Sections 341, 323, 324, 506, 148, 149 IPC and Sections 3(1) and 4 of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (here-in-after to be referred as “the SC/ST Act”) wherein the offence under Section 326 IPC is stated to have been added subsequently vide DDR No.31 dated 04.07.2021.

Ms. Samina Dhir, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, has joined the proceedings in pursuance of the copy of this petition having been sent to the respondent-State in advance.

Mr. Vishal Thakur, Advocate, has also joined the proceedings on behalf of the complainant and has sent his power of attorney to this Court, through email and the same has been placed on the record.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant in the

....

present petition and have also perused the file thoroughly.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case whereas he had no role to play in the alleged occurrence and the offence under Section 326 IPC has also been added later-on with an ulterior motive to facilitate the arrest of the petitioner in the instant case.

However, these contentions are devoid of any force because as mentioned earlier, the subject FIR has been registered with the allegations of the commission of various offences including the offence under the provisions of the SC/ST Act as enumerated above and it being so, Section 18 of the SC/ST Act becomes applicable to the instant petition and the same provides as under: -

*“nothing in Section 438 of the Code shall apply in relation to any case involving the arrest of any person on an accusation of having committed an offence under this Act.”*

In view of these provisions, it is crystal clear that the petition in hand is not maintainable and hence, the same deserves dismissal.

Resultantly, the present petition stands dismissed accordingly.

26.07.2021  
neetu

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)  
JUDGE

*Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether Reportable*

*Yes/No  
Yes/No*