

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



CRA-S-3249-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.03.2026

AMANPREET KAUR **... APPELLANT**
VERSUS
STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER **... RESPONDENTS**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Vaibhav Goel, Advocate with
Mr. N.S.Gill, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Parneet Singh Pandher, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Amit K. Saini, Advocate for respondent No.2.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The appellant is aggrieved by the impugned order dated 06.10.2025 passed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Ludhiana whereby her application for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 10 dated 27.1.2020, under Section 3 of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, (for short 'the Act') registered at Police Station Sidhwan Bet, Ludhiana has been dismissed.
2. In compliance of the order dated 10.02.2026, DSP Jaswinder Singh, PPS, Sub Division Jagraon is present in the Court today and submits that the appellant has already joined the investigation.
3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the dispute between the parties pertained to the rendition of accounts. However, the matter escalated when the complainant arrived at the residence/place of the appellant, upon which the appellant contacted the Women Helpline No. 181.

By the time the police reached the spot, the complainant had already fled. Learned counsel further submits that the a false complaint has been lodged by the complainant under Section 3 of the Act while attracting the provisions of 3(Q) of the Act.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that as per the report of SIT as well as the DSP, the complaint made to the Police at the helpline number was found to be false and was lodged merely with the intention of harassing the complainant. To support his contentions, he has relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Kiran Vs. Rajkumar Jivraj Jain; SLP (Crl.) No. 8169 of 2025.***

6. At this stage, it would not be appropriate to place complete reliance upon the said report, as the genesis of the occurrence does not emanate solely from the call made to the helpline number. The dispute between the parties essentially pertains to the rendition of accounts. It has further been stated that the police had earlier filed cancellation reports on two occasions before the Court. Subsequently, when the matter was sent for further investigation, the SIT report was submitted, which appears to contradict the findings recorded in the earlier cancellation reports. In such circumstances, the learned trial Court is required to consider the entire material and evidence on record in its totality, particularly when three separate reports have been placed before it. It is also contended that after the filing of the earlier cancellation reports, the subsequent report does not bring on record any additional evidence so as to justify a change in the conclusion. Nevertheless, the conclusion has been altered, which *prima facie* appears to amount to an abuse of the process of law.

7. Since the matter is before this Court to consider whether the

offence is made out or not, at this stage, this Court is of the opinion that since the appellant has already appeared and joined the investigation before the DSP and is not required for any further investigation, therefore, the order dated 06.10.2025 passed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Ludhiana is hereby set aside and the appeal is allowed.

7. As the appellant has already joined the investigation, accordingly, the order dated 17.10.2025 passed by the Co-Ordinate Bench of this Court is hereby made absolute, subject to the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

06.03.2026
Janki

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No