

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Appeal (SJ) No.1291 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -179 Year- 2017 Thana -WARISNAGAR District- SAMASTIPUR

- =====
1. Rajesh Kumar @ Rajesh Kumar Sahni, son of Satrudhan Sahni @ Shatrudhan Sahni.
2. Punam Devi, wife of Dukha Sahni.

.... Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Ranjan Kumar, Adv

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Binay Krishna, SPP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 03-07-2018

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

This is an appeal under Sections 14(A)(2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, against refusal of the prayer for anticipatory bail by order dated 08.01.2018 by the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge, Samastipur in connection with Warisnagar P.S.Case No. 179 of 2017 registered under Sections 323, 338, 337, 504, 341, 379/34 of the Indian Penal Code as well as under Sections 3(i)(r) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Act.

The FIR would reveal that the occurrence of assault and abuse allegedly took place for the reason that the informant was constructing his house very closed to the road, the



appellant protested as obstruction in the movement of the vehicle.

Considering the nature of allegation, let the appellants, above named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.20,000 (Twenty Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned court below where the case is pending in connection with the aforesaid case, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure and both bailors shall be resident of territorial jurisdiction of the learned court below and further the appellants shall fully cooperate with the investigation/trial of the case, failing which the court below shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bond of the appellants.

Accordingly, the impugned order is set aside and this appeal stands allowed.

(Birendra Kumar, J)

Nitesh/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	04.07.2018
Transmission Date	04.07.2018

