

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.208 of 2023

In
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59261 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-172 Year-2020 Thana- JAMUI District- Jamui

CHANDAN KUMAR @ CHANDAN SINGH Son of Satya Narayan Singh
Resident of Village - Lakhanpur, P.O.- Gopalpur, P.S. and District - Jamui.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Satya Ranjan Sinha

For the Respondent/s : Mrs. Usha Kumari 1

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

5 21-06-2023 I.A. No.01 of 2023 has been filed for condonation of
delay of four months in filing the instant appeal.

For the reasons stated in I.A. No.01 of 2023, the delay
of four months in filing the instant appeal is hereby condoned.

I.A. No.01 of 2023 is allowed.

Heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned
Special Public Prosecutor for the State.

In view of the earlier order dated 19.04.2023, the
informant was informed about his appearance in this case by the
learned Special P.P. for the State, but nobody has entered
appearance on his behalf.

This is an appeal under Section 14(A)(2) of the
Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of



Atrocities) Act, 1989 (hereinafter referred to as 'the SC/ST Act') against the refusal of prayer of anticipatory bail vide order dated 07.07.2022, passed by learned A.D.J.-I, Jamui in connection with Jamui P.S. Case No.172 of 2020, registered under Sections 147, 148, 149, 302, 307, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3(2)(v) of the SC/ST Act.

Accusation against the appellant and other co-accused persons is of killing the father of the informant.

Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the appellant has got no criminal antecedent as stated in paragraph-3 of the memo of appeal. It is further submitted that allegation made against the appellant is totally false and concocted. It is submitted that the appellant is working in CRPF and he was not present at the place of occurrence, in support of which he annexed Identity Card and railway ticket of the appellant as Annexure-2 to the memo of appeal.

Learned Special P.P. for the State opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the appellant.

Taking into consideration the facts aforesaid, I am not inclined to enlarge the appellant on anticipatory bail.



Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the appellant is hereby rejected.

However, if appellant surrenders before the learned court below within a period of six weeks from today and prays for regular bail, the learned court below shall consider the prayer for regular bail of the appellant preferably on the same day without being prejudiced by this order considering the fact that appellant is working in CRPF.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

S.KUMAR/-

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

