

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.4055 of 2019**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-19 Year-2019 Thana- SC/ST District- Jehanabad

SONU KUMAR Son of Rajnandan Yadav @ Rajnandan Singh @ Mukhiya
Jee Resident of Mohalla- Kalinagar/Horilganj, P.S. and District- Jehanabad.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr.Paras Nath

For the Respondent/s : Mrs.Usha Kumari 1

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER**

4 03-12-2019 Heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned
counsel for the State.

The appellant in this case is challenging the order dated 20.08.2019 passed in ABP No.862 of 2019 in Jehanabad SC/ST P.S. Case No.19 of 2019 by learned Additional Sessions Judge-1st, Jehanabad whereby and whereunder the anticipatory bail of the appellant, filed for the offence under Sections 341, 323, 504, 506 and 307/34 of the I.P.C. and Section 3(1)(r)(s) and 3(2)(va) of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 has been rejected.

Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. Learned counsel submits that there is no specific allegation of assault against this appellant.



Learned counsel for the State is present and has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the appellant.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case wherein it appears on perusal of the case diary that some injuries have been found on the body of the son of the informant, the allegation against the petitioner is that he had assaulted him by belt, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned order. The appeal is, thus, dismissed.

In case, however, the appellant surrenders and prays for regular bail in the court below within a period of four weeks from today, his prayer for regular bail shall be considered on its own merit without being prejudiced by the order of this Court and the same shall not be rejected only because this Court has refused to grant anticipatory bail to the appellant. It must be an independent exercise by the court below.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

arvind/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

