



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

CRA-S No. 1799 of 2026 (O&M)

Reserved on: 27.05.2026

Pronounced on: 29.05.2026

Uploaded on: 29.05.2026

*Whether only operative part of the judgment is
Pronounced or the full judgment is pronounced: operative part/full judgment*

Bakhtour Singh

...Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Argued by:- Mr. Parampreet Singh Brar, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Hardeep Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jaspreet Singh Brar, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANDEEP PANNU, J.

1. The present appeal has been filed under Section 14-A of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 seeking anticipatory bail.

2. The present appeal has been filed by the appellant against the impugned order dated 12.05.2026, whereby the anticipatory bail of the appellant in case bearing FIR No.125 dated 29.04.2026 registered under Section 351(2) of the B.N.S. and Sections 3 and 4 of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 at Police Station



Sadar Faridkot, District Faridkot, Punjab, has been dismissed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridkot.

3. Briefly stated, the present FIR was registered on the allegations levelled by the complainant that the appellant along with his son Ranjit Singh and other unknown persons had been continuously harassing the complainant and her family by using caste based derogatory remarks and threats. It was alleged that on 22.12.2025, the appellant came to the house of the complainant and started abusing her and her family by using insulting caste related words, namely “*Kutte Chuhre Diyan Muchha Putt Devange*” and further threatened them by saying “*Kutte Chuhria Nuu Hor Ki Sodhi Sahib Keha Jawe*”. It was further alleged that on 25.12.2025, the appellant again entered the house of the complainant and used derogatory caste related words by stating “*Kutte Chuhre Muchha Rakhde Han*”. Thereafter, the appellant and his son allegedly threatened the complainant and her family by stating that they had direct relations with goons and miscreants and also threatened them with dire consequences. It was further alleged that in the evening of 25.12.2025, the appellant along with his son and 2-3 unknown persons armed with 12 bore guns roamed near the house of the complainant and threatened to kill them if they came out of the house. The motive behind the occurrence has been stated to be a dispute regarding a piece of land purchased by the complainant side.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the appellant that the appellant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case due to political rivalry. It is submitted that the appellant is a senior citizen



aged about 71 years. Learned counsel has further contended that the allegations levelled in the present FIR are false, fabricated and concocted. It is argued that the inquiry conducted by the concerned police officer was one-sided, biased and conducted under political influence without properly hearing the appellant side or verifying the allegations from the villagers. It is further submitted that prior to registration of the present FIR, an application was moved by Sukhpreet Kaur wife of Bhagga Singh against the appellant and others, upon which an inquiry was conducted by the concerned police officials of Police Station Sadar Faridkot. During the said inquiry, statements of the parties were recorded and it was found that there was no truth in the allegations regarding use of abusive and casteist remarks against the complainant party and no abusive language was found to have been used. It was accordingly recommended that no further action was required and the complaint be filed. Learned counsel for the appellant has further argued that thereafter, the complainant approached the Scheduled Castes Commission and only on the directions issued by the said Commission, the present FIR came to be registered. It is thus contended that there is no truth in the allegations levelled against the appellant.

5. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has opposed the present appeal and submitted that specific allegations have been levelled against the appellant regarding use of caste-based derogatory remarks and criminal intimidation. It is contended that on 22.12.2025 and again on 25.12.2025, the appellant entered the house of the complainant and abused the complainant party by using derogatory words



relating to their caste in the presence of witnesses namely Gurbaksh Singh, Jasvir Singh, Kashmir Singh and Kulwinder Singh. It is further submitted that thereafter, the appellant along with his son Ranjit Singh and 2-3 unknown persons armed with 12 bore guns roamed near the house of the complainant and extended threats to kill the complainant and her family members. Learned State counsel has further argued that during investigation, statements of various witnesses namely Kulwinder Singh, Kewal Singh, Nahar Singh, Gurbaksh Singh, Sukhdeep Kaur, Jasvir Singh and Charanjit Singh were recorded, which fully corroborate the allegations levelled in the FIR. It is thus contended that a *prima-facie* case under the provisions of the SC/ST Act is made out against the appellant and, therefore, he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the paper-book as well as the record of the case with their able assistance.

7. The specific allegations against the appellant are that he intentionally uttered caste-based derogatory remarks against the complainant, who belongs to Scheduled Caste community, and also extended threats to the complainant party. As per the allegations, the appellant visited the house of the complainant on 22.12.2025 and again on 25.12.2025 and used derogatory language relating to the caste of the complainant in the presence of various persons namely Gurbaksh Singh, Jasvir Singh, Kashmir Singh and Kulwinder Singh. There are further allegations that thereafter, the appellant along with his son and other



unknown persons armed with weapons threatened the complainant party with dire consequences.

8. During investigation, statements of various witnesses namely Kulwinder Singh, Kewal Singh, Nahar Singh, Gurbaksh Singh, Sukhdeep Kaur, Jasvir Singh and Charanjit Singh were recorded and the said witnesses have corroborated the allegations levelled by the complainant. Thus, at this stage, there is sufficient material available on record to *prima-facie* connect the appellant with the occurrence in question.

9. The contention raised by learned counsel for the appellant that the present case is a result of village rivalry or political enmity is a disputed question of fact, which cannot be conclusively adjudicated upon by this Court while exercising jurisdiction in the present anticipatory bail appeal and the same would require appreciation of evidence during the course of trial.

10. So far as the earlier inquiry relied upon by learned counsel for the appellant is concerned, though it was opined therein that no truth was found in the allegations levelled by the complainant, however, subsequently during further inquiry/investigation, statements of several witnesses were recorded, who supported the allegations made in the FIR and found the appellant along with the co-accused involved in the commission of offence. Therefore, merely because the earlier inquiry did not recommend action against the appellant, the same would not by itself demolish the prosecution case at this preliminary stage.

11. Keeping in view the nature and gravity of allegations, the



specific role attributed to the appellant, the statements of witnesses supporting the prosecution version and the applicability of provisions of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the appellant.

12. Accordingly, the present appeal stands dismissed.

13. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

14. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

29.05.2026
neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>