



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

142

CRA-S-3800-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 10.03.2026

VEENA

.....Appellant

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Amardeep Singh, Advocate
for the appellant.

Dr. (Ms.) Savi Nagpal, Asst. A.G. Punjab.

Ms. Jasneet Mehra, Advocate for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-49374-2025

Application is allowed as prayed for and Annexures P-1 to P-3
are taken on record.

CRA-S-3800-2025

The present appeal has been filed against the order dated 18.11.2025 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar in case bearing FIR No. 191 dated 24.09.2025 registered under Sections 125, 351(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and Section 3(2) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 & Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Chheharta, Amritsar whereby the anticipatory bail petition filed by the appellant has been dismissed.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant contends that as per the prosecution story, on 24.09.2025, at about 9:15 AM, Gurdev Singh-brother of the complainant, was going back to his house but on the way, the appellant herein and her son Jodha alongwith her grandson Jaskaran Singh, started abusing Gurdev Singh. The complainant allegedly tried to pacify them but the appellant(s) are stated to have continued uttering bad words and also grappled with him. Thereafter, Ranjodh Singh brought a 12 bore rifle from his house and fired a gun shot in air which did not hit anybody. A terror was created in the society. It was alleged that casteist remarks were also made. The FIR reads thus:-

“Statement of Gurjinder Singh son of Piara Singh resident of Street No. 2 New Ranjit Pura Chhehrata Amritsar age about 46 years mobile number 75089-09421 stated that I am a resident of the above address and work as a property dealer. We, three brothers, live together with our families. Today at around 9:15 am in morning, my brother Gurdev Singh was coming home from outside and Kulwant Singh's wife Veena, his son Jodha and grandson Jaskaran Singh, who were living in front of our house, were abusing my brother Gurdev Singh. Hearing the commotion in the street, we also came out. I tried to stop the fight, but Kulwant Singh's wife, his son Jodha and grandson Jaskaran Singh did not stopped. Our family also started talking bad about them and they started fighting with us. In the meantime Kulwant Singh's son Ranjodh Singh alias Jodha brought a 12 bore single-barrel rifle from his house and came and fired in the air, which naturally did not hit anyone. This created an atmosphere of terror in the neighborhood. We entered our house in fear and Ranjodh Singh alias Jodha with his Rifle ran away threatening to kill us with his rifle from the spot. The reason is that on 22-9-2025, my brother Gurdev Singh's daughter Ashwin Kaur was called by Kulwant Singh's

wife Veena to her house and she got her clothes changed at her house and and sent her back. We suspect that they want to get wrong things done from our daughter. Action should be taken against Ranjodh Singh alias Jodha, Jaskaran Singh, Veena wife Kulwant Singh above-said.”

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant(s) contends that there is no allegation of the appellant having used any weapon or causing any injury or even making derogatory casteist remark. Besides, the offence under Section 109 BNS would not be made out in as much as the allegation itself shows that the co-accused had fired a shot in the air so as to ward off any attack. He contends that the appellant has no criminal antecedents and she is a woman aged 65 years. It is contended that since the primary ingredients for attracting an offence under the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act are not made out and no recovery of any nature whatsoever is to be effected from the appellant, hence, concession of anticipatory bail ought to be extended to the appellant.

4. Learned State Counsel contends that as per the investigation conducted, the appellant and her family members hurled abuses to Gurdev Singh and scuffled with him. They also made casteist remarks in public. She contends that the remark was “*Mang Khani Kaum*” which on translation would mean “a community which begs for food”. She does not dispute that there is no allegation of the appellant having caused any injury or any specific role of the appellant having hurled any abusive remarks.

5. Counsel for the complainant reiterates the allegation and contends that the complainant and the members of his family were sought to be threatened by the use of fire arms and hurling of abuses by the appellant and members of her family.

6. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present appeal.

7. The respondent(s) could not point out any injury having been caused by the appellant or the appellant even having used any specific abusive remark intended to humiliate a member belonging to the Scheduled Caste in public view. Besides, she is a woman aged 65 years. *Prime facie*, it will be arguable whether the offences under the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities), Act, 1989 would be made out or not. The appellant has clean antecedents and no recovery is to be effected from her.

8. Consequently, the present appeal is allowed and the appellant is directed to join investigation as and when required by the Investigating Agency. In the event of appellant joining investigation, she shall be admitted to interim bail by the arresting officer/investigating officer on furnishing of bail bonds by her to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/investigating officer. The appellant shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023. It is, however, made clear that the appellant shall continue to join investigation and extend all cooperation to the Investigating Agency. In the event of the appellant not extending due cooperation, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application for seeking cancellation of the bail granted by this Court.

MARCH 10, 2026

Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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