

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

2025:PHHC:035896



(203)

**CRA-S-3515-2023(O&M)
Date of Decision: 17.03.2025**

Pargat Singh & others

--Appellants

Versus

State of Punjab & another

--Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL.

Present:- Mr. T.S. Grewal, Advocate for appellants.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL.J (Oral)

The appellants are challenging order dated 15.11.2023 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur, whereby their application for grant of anticipatory bail in case GD No.03 dated 03.07.2019 under Sections 3, 4 of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (for short, 'the SC/ST Act') and Sections 323, 148 and 149 of the IPC, 1860 in FIR No.92 dated 01.07.2019 under Sections 353, 186, 323, 506, 148, 149 and 332 of the IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Amargarh, District Sangrur, was dismissed.

On 04.09.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the appellants, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the appellants and asked them to join investigation:-

“Learned counsel for the appellants while drawing the attention of this Court to the allegations levelled in the GD, has argued that all the offences alleged against the appellants

are bailable in nature except for offences under SC/ST Act. While further drawing the attention of this Court to the allegations in the GD, it has been asserted that the casteist utterances have been specifically levelled against coaccused Beant Singh, who has since been extended the concession of regular bail by the learned Trial Court; the appellants are only shown to be present with co-accused Beant Singh, who allegedly indulged in casteist utterances.”

Learned counsel for the appellants submits that in compliance of order dated 04.09.2024, the appellants have joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the appellants are not required for further investigation much less for their custodial interrogation.

Despite service having been effected upon the complainant, none entered appearance on his behalf on the previous date of hearing nor has anyone appeared on his behalf today.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed the submissions made by learned counsel for the appellants and on further instructions submits that the appellants are not required for their custodial interrogation.

In view of the above, the appeal is allowed and interim order dated 04.09.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

17.03.2025

lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No