

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.2601 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-225 Year-2020 Thana- PATAHI District- East Champaran

=====

RAM NARESH RAM @ RAM NARESH JI S/o Late Rajendra Ram R/o
village- Barna Bas Ghat, P.S.- Baruraj, District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Sharda Nand Mishra

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sadanand Paswan

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 28-06-2022 Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned
counsel for the informant and learned Special Public Prosecutor
for the State.

Learned counsel for the appellant undertakes to
remove the defects within four weeks of resumption of normal
court proceeding. In the eventuality of non-removal of defects
within undertaken period, the office will place the matter before
the Bench.

This is an appeal under Section 14(A)(2) of the
Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of
Atrocities) Act, 1989 (hereinafter in short referred to as the
'SC/ST Act') against the refusal of prayer for anticipatory bail
vide order dated 15.03.2021 passed by learned 1st Additional
Sessions Judge cum Special Judge (SC/ST Act), East



Champaran, Motihari in connection with Patahi P.S. Case No. 225/2020 registered under Sections 302 & 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3(1) (x) (v) and 3 (2) (v) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act.

The allegation against this appellant is that he in association of other co-accused is said to have committed the murder of son of the informant.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the appellant that no such occurrence as alleged ever took place. Appellant has been falsely implicated in the case. Appellant is the proprietor of the dance party. It is further submitted that informant also belongs to SC/ST community, hence no offence is made out under SC/ST Act. There is no eye witness of the occurrence. The allegation levelled against the appellant is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. Appellant has no criminal antecedent.

Learned counsel for the informant and learned Spl. PP for the State opposed the prayer for bail submitting that the allegation against the appellant is serious in nature, hence he does not deserve anticipatory bail.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, I am



not inclined to enlarge the appellant on anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

Accordingly, this appeal is dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Trivedi/-

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

