

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Appeal (SJ) No.105 of 2018**

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -60 Year- 2016 Thana -SC/ST District- SASARAM (ROHTAS)

=====

1. Triloki Singh, Son of Late Manohar Singh,  
2. Sunita Devi, Wife of Triloki Singh, Both residents of Village-  
Bhadkudiya, Police Station- Indrapuri, District- Rohtas at Sasaram.

.... .... Appellants

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... .... Respondent

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Raghunandan Kumar Singh

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Binay Krishna

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      08-02-2018

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

This is an appeal under Section 14(A)(2) of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 against the refusal of prayer for anticipatory bail by the learned 1<sup>st</sup> Additional Sessions Judge, Rohtas at Sasaram, in connection with S.C./S.T. Dihri P.S. Case No.60 of 2016 registered under Sections 341, 354, 323, 504, 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3(i)(r)(s)(w)(i)(ii) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.

The appellant Triloki Singh allegedly attempted to sexually assault the informant. When the informant went to the house to protest against the act of appellant Triloki Singh, appellant Sunita Devi allegedly abused by taking her caste name



and committed assault.

Considering the nature of allegation against appellant Triloki Singh, I am not inclined to enlarge him on anticipatory bail. Offence under the provisions of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act prima facie discloses against appellant Sunita Devi. Hence, the prayer is bared under Section 18 of the SC/ST Act.

Accordingly, the appeal stands dismissed.

**(Birendra Kumar, J)**

Amit/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

