IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Appeal (S.J.) No. 108 of 2026
------

1. Baso Yadav, aged about 63 years, S/o Late Badri Yadav
2. Ashok Yadav, aged about 53 years, S/o Late Badri Yadav
3. Keval Yadav @ Kewal Yadav, aged about 49 years, S/o Late Badri Yadav

Appellant No. 1 to 3 are resident of Panchayat-Dhuraita, Village-Khandidih, P.O.-Dhuraita & P.S.-Hirodih, Dist.-Giridih

.... …. Appellants

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Gena Ravidas, S/o late Girdhari Das, R/o Village Baledih, P.O.-Dhuraita, P.S.-Hirodih, Dist.-Giridih

.... Respondents

With

Cr. Appeal (S.J.) No. 51 of 2026
------

1. Shankar Yadav @ Shankar Kumar Yadav, aged about 23 years, S/o Jagi Yadav @ Jagdish Yadav
2. Karu Yadav @ Ravindra Yadav, aged about 50 years, S/o Jagi Yadav @ Jagdish Yadav

Appellant No. 1 to 2 are resident of Panchayat-Dhuraita, Village-Khandidih, P.O.-Dhuraita & P.S.-Hirodih, Dist.-Giridih

.... …. Appellants

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Gena Ravidas, S/o late Girdhari Das, R/o Village Baledih, P.O.-Dhuraita & P.S.-Hirodih, Dist.-Giridih

.... Respondents

With

Cr. Appeal (S.J.) No. 123 of 2026
------

1. Bhuna Yadav, aged about 52 years, S/o Late Ratan Yadav @ Ratan Mahto
2. Sudhir Yadav @ Sudhir Kumar Yadav, aged about 46 years, S/o Late Ratan Yadav @ Laxman Yadav
3. Ajit Yadav @ Ajit Kumar Yadav, aged about 35 years, S/o Hari Yadav @ Harihar Yadav

Appellant No. 1 to 3 are resident of Panchayat-Dhuraita, Village-Khandidih, P.O.-Dhuraita & P.S.-Hirodih, Dist.-Giridih

.... …. Appellants

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Gena Ravidas, S/o late Girdhari Das, R/o Village Baledih, P.O.-Dhuraita & P.S.-Hirodih, Dist.-Giridih

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR

For the Appellants : Mr. Govind Ray Karan, Advocate
Mrs. Kabisha Goenka, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Shiv Shankar Kumar, A.P.P.
For the Victim : Ms. Karishma Kumari, Adv.
Mr. Sunil Kumar Rana, Adv.

Order No.10 / Dated : 01.09.2026.

1. These criminal appeals have been filed under Section 14-A (2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act.
2. Heard learned counsel for the appellants, learned counsel for the State and the learned counsel for the respondent No.2/victim.
3. In pursuant of the order dated 18.08.2026, Mr. Jeetmohan Swansi, ASI Hirodih, P.S. Giridih is present before this Court.
4. Although Section 18 of the SC/ST (PoA) Act bars the grant of anticipatory bail, such bar would not apply in case where no *prima facie* offence under the Act is made out.
5. These appeals have been filed against the common order dated 04.12.2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge 1st-cum-Special Judge, SC/ST, Giridih in A.B.P No.1603 of 2025 in connection with Hirodih P.S. Case No.23 of 2025, for the offences under Sections 191 (2), 115 (2), 352, 351 (2) of B.N.S. and Section 3 (i),(r),(s) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, whereby the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail of the appellants has been rejected. The matters are presently pending in the Court of learned Special Judge, SC/ST Act, Giridih.
6. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the appellants that there is a land dispute between the parties. It has been further submitted that there is a delay of about 15 days in filing of the F.I.R. and the entire allegation is false and frivolous. On the above basis, prayer for anticipatory bail has been made.
7. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State and the learned counsel for the victim have opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submitted that the land, in question, has been given to the victim on *bhudaan* and some portion of the land is being used for cultivation, but he has been stopped from cultivating the land and this itself is a crime

under the SC/ST Act. Further, he has been assaulted and abused in a public place. Thus, section 18 of the SC/ST (PoA) Act gets attracted and the appellants does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

8. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the record, it appears that the offence under the SC/ST Act is made out and section 18 of the Act gets attracted.
9. Considering the above facts, I am not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the appellants. Accordingly, these criminal appeals are, hereby, dismissed.
10. The personal appearance of the aforesaid Official is, hereby, dispensed with.

(**Rajesh Kumar, J.**)

01.09.2026
Pawan/
Uploaded on 02.09.2026