

29

SC 1017/2022

STATE Vs. ANJANA RANI

FIR No. 440/2022

PS (South Rohini)

29.01.2026

Regular PP for the State is on leave today and he is also looking after the work of other court.

Present : Ms. Sarita Rani, Ld. Substitute PP for the State.
Sh. R P Dhanias & Sh. Satish Solanki, Ld. counsels for the complainant.

Arguments on charge have already been heard.

It was submitted by counsel for the accused persons that they have been falsely implicated by the complainant. It is submitted that so such incident as alleged by the complainant on 17.09.2022 and 23.08.2021 took place. It is submitted that alleged incident dt. 23.08.2021 was never informed by the complainant at that time. It is further submitted that the alleged incident is not covered under the Special Act.

With regard to the incident dt. 17.09.2022, it is submitted that no such caste remarks were ever made by the accused persons. It is submitted that the witnesses namely Virender, Om Prakash, Pushpa, Ashok Kumar etc are not reliable. It is submitted that Om Prakash is an interested witness. It is further submitted that due to complaint filed by one of the accused persons against the complainant, the present false case has been levelled upon the accused persons.

It is submitted by Ld Addl. PP for the State that there is sufficient material to frame charges against the accused persons.

Heard. Perused.

With regard to the incident dt. 23.08.2021, it is admitted fact that the same is alleged to take place inside the office. The incident is not alleged to have committed in the public view. Therefore, the alleged incident dt. 23.08.2021 is not covered under the special act with regard to the incident dt. 17.09.2022, there is special mention of the accused Seema making castists remark to the complainant in the statement u/s 161 Cr. P.C of accused Om Prakash. Though accused Om Prakash himself pertains to SC Category but the same cannot be a ground to reject his statement. Apart from the accused Om Prakash, Raj Bahadur has also stated that Vikram Sharma had also made castists remark on 17.09.2022 against the complainant. In the statement of Pushpa, there is mention of one fact that women making castist remark but there is supplementary statement to identify the alleged women who made the castist remark but there is no supplementary statement to identify the alleged women whom made the castists remark.

Similarly, in the statement of Virender @ Sandeep, there is mention of one healthy lady making castists remarks but the same is ambiguous and in the absence of any supplementary statement to identify the accused, the same is meaningless. Therefore, on the basis of statement of one Om Prakash and Raj Bahadur alongwith statement of complainant, prima facie charges u/s 3 (1) (R) (S) SC/ST Act are made out against accused Vikram Sharma and Seema Jha.

Accused Anjana Rani is discharged in the absence of strong evidence.

In view of the above circumstances, put up for framing of charge against the accused Vikram Sharma & Seema Jha u/s 3 (1) (R) (S) SC/ST Act on 07.02.2026.

(SHIVAJI ANAND)
ASJ-II/SPECIAL JUDGE NDPS/
NORTH-WEST/ROHINI COURTS/
DELHI/29.01.2026