



ITEM NO.2

COURT NO.7

SECTION II-E

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G SPetition for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No.4967/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 02-03-2026 in CRA No. 442/2026 passed by the High Court of Gujarat at Ahmedabad]

ANAND SINGH

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF GUJARAT &amp; ANR.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 85216/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No.85217/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. AND IA No. 102071/2026 - PERMISSION TO PLACE ON RECORD SUBSEQUENT FACTS)

Date : 06-05-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE UJJAL BHUYAN

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. R. Sudhakaran, AOR

For Respondent(s) :

Ms. Swati Ghildiyal, AOR

Ms. Sonakshi Sinha, Adv.

Mr. Nitin Meshram, Adv.

Mr. Surya Pratap Deva, Adv.

Mr. Ranbir Singh Yadav, AOR

Mr. Prabhat Pachauri, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

1. Exemption Applications are allowed.
2. The petitioner has been denied anticipatory bail by the High Court in connection with the First Information Report bearing CR No.11191036260006 of 2026 registered with Navrangpura Police Station, Ahmedabad City, for the offence punishable under Sections 69 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short "BNS") and

Sections 3(2)(v), 3(1)(w)(i) and 3(1)(w)(ii) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act (for short "Atrocities Act") respectively.

3. *Prima facie*, it appears from the materials on record and the nature of the allegations leveled in the FIR that the petitioner and the first informant were in a relationship. Something went wrong and the relations got strained.

4. It is the case of the petitioner that over a period of time, the first informant used to threaten him that she would go to the extent of committing suicide. In this regard, a complaint was also lodged by the petitioner with the police.

5. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner could be said to have duped the first informant after maintaining relations with her for a good period of time and that led the first informant to go to the extent of attempting to commit suicide.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the Respondent No. 2 (original first informant/victim) would submit that having regard to the bar of Section 18 under the Atrocities Act, this Court may not exercise discretion in favor of the petitioner insofar as his plea for anticipatory bail is concerned.

7. While issuing notice vide Order dated 20th March, 2026, we protected the petitioner from any coercive steps being taken against him.

8. The learned counsel appearing for the State would submit that the petitioner has joined the investigation and he has appeared before the investigating officer for the purpose of his interrogation.

9. We also take notice of the fact that the petitioner is 23 years of age and the first informant is 21 years of age.

10. Insofar as the contention raised by the learned counsel appearing for Respondent No. 2 regarding the bar of Section 18 of the Atrocities Act is concerned, we may only say that it would all depend on the facts of each case. It would also depend on the

nature of the allegations levelled in the FIR and the other materials on record. Section 18 of the Atrocities Act should not be applied mechanically.

11. In the overall view of the matter, we are convinced that the petitioner has been able to make out a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

12. The order passed by us dated 20-3-2026 is made absolute

13. With the aforesaid, this petition stands disposed of.

14. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(VISHAL ANAND)  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

(POOJA SHARMA)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)