

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.149 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-276 Year-2022 Thana- ROSHANGANJ District- Gaya

PINTU YADAV @ PINTU KUMAR S/o Vishnudeo Yadav R/v- Delho, P.S.-
Banke Bazar, District- Gaya

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. MAMTA KUMARI D/o Rajdeo Rikiyasan R/v- Delho, P.O.- Tiliaya, P.S.-
Banke Bazar, District- Gaya

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. N. A. Shamsi
For the Respondent/s	:	Mrs. Usha Kumari 1
		Mr. Arvind Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 03-05-2023 Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned counsel for the respondent no.2 and learned Special Public Prosecutor for the State.

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 of anticipatory bail vide order dated 01.12.2022 passed by learned Special Judge (SC/ST Act) Gaya, in connection with Raushanganj P.S. Case No.276 of 2022, registered under Sections 354(d), 504, 506 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3(i) (r) (s) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act.

The prosecution case is that, the appellant passed unpleasant



remarks on the informant and allured her with wrong words while she was on the way to her school and when she opposed, the appellant also threatened for dire consequences.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the appellant that no such occurrence as alleged ever took place. It is submitted by learned counsel for the appellant that the appellant has no concern with the aforesaid occurrence. He has been falsely implicated in the case due to dirty village politics. He submits that the appellant has never passed any remarks on the informant nor has called her by her caste name. Appellant has no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this memo of appeal.

Learned Spl. PP for the State as well as learned counsel for the respondent no.2 opposed the prayer for bail by submitting that there is a specific allegation against the appellant to pass unpleasant remarks on the informant.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to enlarge the appellant on bail. The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail on his behalf is hereby rejected.

Accordingly, this appeal is dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

shikha/-

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

