

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.4316 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-142 Year-2021 Thana- BARH District- Patna

=====

RANJIT SINGH @ RANJEET SINGH Son of Ravindra Singh Resident of
Village - Langarpur, P.S.- Barh, District - Patna.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Anita Devi Wife of Late Suraj Paswan Resident of Village - Hussainganj
Langarpur, P.S.- Barh, District - Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Raj Krishna Jha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sadanand Paswan, Special PP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 01-02-2023 From perusal of the ordersheet, it appears that the

order dated 04.01.2023 has wrongly been typed as order no.3 in

place of order no.2.

Let it be so corrected and the order dated 04.01.2023
be read as order no.2.

Heard learned counsel for the appellant 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 for bail vide order
dated 14.11.2022 passed by the learned Special Judge (SC/ST



Act), Patna in connection with Special Case No.104/2021, arising out of Barh P.S. Case No. 142 of 2021 registered under Section 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code, Section 27 of the Arms Act and Section 3(2) (v) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act.

The appellant in association of other co-accused is said to have shot dead the husband 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. Neither the informant nor her brother-in-law is an eye witness to the occurrence . Even from the F.I.R., it is evident that the husband of the informant was on friendly terms with the appellant and other co-accused persons and therefore he went away with them. It is further submitted that similarly situated co-accused, namely, Golu Singh @ Shubham Singh @ Sukaj Singh has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 27.01.2022 passed in Cr. Appeal (SJ) No.4038 of 2021, whereas co-accused, Md. Raja @ Raja has been granted bail vide order dated 07.07.2022 passed in Cr. Appeal (SJ) No.525 of 2022 . Appellant has been languishing in custody since 19.04.2021.

Earlier the prayer for bail of this appellant was



rejected vide a detailed order dated 10.03.2022 passed in Cr. Appeal (SJ) No.4526 of 2021 with a liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

Learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that charge has already been framed against the appellant and other co-accused on 02.08.2022

Learned Spl. PP for the State opposed the prayer for bail.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, the above named appellant is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Special Judge (SC/ST Act), Patna in connection with Special Case No.104 of 2021, arising out of Barh P.S. 142 of 2021.

Accordingly, the impugned order is set aside and this appeal is allowed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Trivedi/-

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

