



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

101

**CRA-S-3717-2025 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 22.05.2026**

AYUSH @ ASHU

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Robin Singh Hooda, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Lalit K. Narang, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present appeal has been filed by the appellant, challenging the order dated 21.11.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rohtak, whereby anticipatory bail petition filed by him, in FIR No.377 dated 04.11.2025 registered under Sections 190, 191(1), 115(2), 351(3), 333 of BNS, 2023, and Sections 3(1)(B), 3(1)(S), 3(2)(VA) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, at Police Station Meham, District Rohtak, has been dismissed.
2. After hearing the submissions addressed by counsel for the appellant, on 01.12.2025, following order was passed:-

“1. XXXX XXXX XXXX XXX
2. *Learned counsel for the appellant, inter alia, contends that in the present case, specific accusation pertains only to co-accused Vijay, and no allegation has been made that appellant or any other*

accused was present at the time when Vijay allegedly urinated while facing the house of the complainant, namely Birmati.

3. *As per the FIR, incident occurred on 29.10.2025 at about 10:00 p.m., when a group of eight accused persons, namely, Vijay, Ashu (appellant herein), Sahil, Poni, Santu, Deepak, Mangtu, and Dinesh, allegedly reached the complainant's house, hurled filthy caste-related abuses, and entered the premises. It is further alleged that injuries were caused to Dinesh, Naresh, Amit, Moni, and complainant, Birmati, on their heads and other vital parts of the body.*

4. *Counsel for the appellant submits that none of the injuries sustained by the victims are of a serious nature and the only role attributed to the appellant is of causing simple injuries. Thus, prayer is made for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the appellant in the present case.*

5. *Notice of motion.*

6. *On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and Mr. Lalit K. Narang, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant, and files his vakalatnama in Court today, which is taken on record.*

7. *Learned State counsel, as well as counsel for the complainant, submit that the doctor's opinion regarding the injuries suffered by the injured persons is still awaited.*

Thus, learned State counsel seeks some time to file status report in the matter along with the medical opinion on the injuries.

8. *This Court has observed that incident took place on 29.10.2025 and injuries were caused to the injured persons; in the normal course, in cases of hurt, doctor's opinion is not expected to be delayed. Therefore, learned State counsel is directed to file status report in the matter after obtaining opinion of the concerned doctor.*

9. *Adjourned to 27.01.2026.*

10. *Meanwhile, appellant shall not be arrested. However, issue of joining of investigation by the appellant would be examined on the next date of hearing, after reviewing the status report, which is yet to be filed by learned State counsel."*

3. As per the allegations, on 22.10.2025, accused Vijay allegedly started urinating while facing the house of the complainant,

namely Birmati. Thereafter, on 29.10.2025, accused Vijay, Ashu (present appellant), and Sahil allegedly came in front of the complainant's house and started hurling filthy caste-related abuses. The specific abusive and caste-based remarks allegedly uttered by them have been reproduced in the FIR itself.

4. Since name of the appellant figures specifically in the FIR, alleging his active participation along with co-accused Vijay in using caste-based abusive language, and in view of the statutory bar contained under Section 18 of the SC/ST Act, coupled with the fact that injured Amit is stated to have suffered a grievous head injury, this Court does not find any ground to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the appellant in the present case. **Accordingly, present appeal is dismissed.**

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

22.05.2026

Lavisha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>