

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.1143 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-193 Year-2019 Thana- AMAS District- Gaya

=====

DURGA YADAV S/o Sri Dev Nandan Yadav Resident of Village-Chandi
Asthan, Police Station- Amas, District-Gaya.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr.Manish Kumar No2 , Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr.Binay Krishna APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

5 01-07-2020 The matter has been listed today for consideration
through Video Conferencing.

The learned counsels are appearing and making
submissions from their residence. The Court Master and
Secretary are also part of this virtual court proceedings from
their homes, all with the aid of audio visual technology.

Heard the parties.

The appellant has preferred the present appeal under
Section 14A(2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled
Tribes(Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 against the refusal
of prayer for regular bail vide order dated 20.02.2020 passed by
learned Exclusive Special Judge, SC/ST Act, Gaya in Amas
P.S. Case No. 193 of 2019 registered under Sections 363 and
365 of the IPC. Later on Sections 364,302,201, 120B and 34 of



the IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act have been added. Thereafter, charge sheet has been submitted under Sections 3(2) (v) of the SC & ST Act.

The First Information report is that informant's husband had gone along one Uday Kumar Verma on 16.10.2019. Later on Uday Kumar Verma informed that the informant's husband had parted company with him. Informant's husband was missing and, therefore, a missing report was lodged on 18.10.2019. Subsequently, the dead body of the informant's husband was recovered from the land of petitioner.

Petitioner's counsel submits that, at best, suspicion has been raised against the petitioner's son Sangram Yadav @ Tejashwi Yadav by saying that he has taken money on the pretext of getting a Government job. Petitioner's son is in custody. It is further submitted that the petitioner is not named accused as per F.I.R.

The learned APP has drawn attention of the Court towards the relevant paragraph of the case diary. It has come in the course of investigation that the petitioner along with his son was collecting money for securing government jobs. It is, in this connection, that the informant's husband and Durga Yadav have developed inimical terms for refund of money received under



such conspiracy to procure government job. He submits that the gravity of the offence is such that the petitioner should not be granted the privilege of bail.

Considering the rival submissions, this Court, for the present, is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Prayer for bail is rejected.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

shyambihari/-

U			
---	--	--	--

