

would invite my attention to the latest position of law revolving around Section 18 of the Act of 1989 and in particular decision in the case of *Prathvi Raj Chauhan vs. Union of India & Ors.* (2020) 4 SCC 727, and would submit that the material compiled in the charge sheet clearly reflect that castiest abuses were hurled and hence Section 3(1)(r) and 3(1)(s) of the Act of 1989 have been invoked.

4] I have perused the statements of distinct witnesses, which have some variation as some of the witnesses have referred to the abuses, whereas others have not. This ultimately is a matter of trial.

Since on completion of investigation charge sheet is filed in February, 2023, the Respondents must face the charges during the trial.

Since the investigation is now complete, though prima facie I find that the interim order suffers from grave perversity as the learned Judge has failed to make reference to the allegations under Section 3(1)(r) and 3(1)(s) of the Act of 1989, where it is alleged that castiest abuses were hurled, but the same was not taken into account, I do not find it justiciable to cancel the pre arrest bail particularly, when the charge sheet is now filed and custodial interrogation of the Respondents is not necessary.

In the wake of above, Appeal stands dismissed.

[BHARATI DANGRE, J]