

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.2155 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-109 Year-2019 Thana- DULHIN BAZAR District- Patna

1. Ranjay Yadav @ Niranjay Yadav Son of Vijay Yadav Resident of Village - Jamui P.S. Dulhin Bazar , District - Patna
2. LALU YADAV @ AJIT YADAV @ LULU YADAV SON OF VIJAY YADAV Resident of Village - Jamui, P.S. Dulhin Bazar , District - Patna
3. TILSHWARI DEVI WIFE OF VIJAY YADAV Resident of Village - Jamui , P.S. Dulhin Bazar , District - Patna
4. RITA DEVI @ SABITA DEVI WIFE OF RANJAN YADAV @ NIRANJAN YADAV Resident of Village - Jamui, P.S. Dulhin Bazar , District - Patna

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. AKLU DAS SON OF SHRI DHODHA MOCHI Resident of Village - Jamui P.S. Dulhin Bazar , District - Patna, Pin code- 801102

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr.Ashok Sinha
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Binay Krishna, Spl. PP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 02-12-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the appellants and learned Spl. P.P. for the State, Sri Binay Krishna.

2. 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 for anticipatory bail vide order dated 27-3-2024 in A.B.P. No. 667 of 2024 passed by the learned Exclusive Special Judge S.C./S.T. (POA) Act, Patna in connection with Dulhin Bazar P.S. Case No. 109 of 2019 registered for the offences punishable



under Sections 341, 325, 307, 354, 148 of the Indian Penal Code as well as Sections 3(1)(r) of the SC/ST Act.

3. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the appellants are persons with clean antecedents and appellants nos. 3 and 4 are women and the informant alleges that on 24-4-2019 at about 7.30 pm he was sitting at his door, when Ranjay Yadav started abusing him by taking caste name and said that if you will not vote for a particular political party, you will be killed, on which the informant protested, when all the accused persons started assaulting by stick, brick and stone, thereafter Ranjay assaulted the informant by an iron rod causing injury on the left side of his head and when his brother's wife came to rescue him, it is alleged that Tileshwari Devi assaulted her by brick causing injury on nose, further brother-in-law of Ranjay acted inappropriately with wife of the informant and also assaulted her, on alarm villagers gathered and the injured was taken to the hospital.

4. The learned counsel for the appellants submits that appellants have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that the case was taken up on 16-9-2025 when notices were issued and from perusal of the office report dated 24-11-2025, it would manifest that the notice was validly received on respondent No. 2 but then respondent No. 2



despite receiving notice chooses not to appear and contest. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation itself, it would manifest that on account of political dispute, an altercation took place and thereafter an exaggerated allegation came to be alleged implicating the entire family members of Ranjay. It is also submitted that though there is specific allegation against Ranjay of assaulting the informant by an iron rod causing injury on head, but then the injury has been opined to be simple. It is submitted that as far as allegation against other accused persons are alleged, the same is general and omnibus in nature.

5. The learned Spl. PP opposes the appeal and submits that there is specific allegation against Ranjay of assaulting the informant by iron rod causing injury on head, but then is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants that as far other appellants are concerned, allegations against them are general and omnibus in nature.

6. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants submits that there is no injury report of the wife of the younger brother of the informant on record, who is alleged to have suffered injury on account of assault by Tileshwari Devi by brick.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the



Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to Ranjay Yadav @ Niranjay Yadav (Appellant No. 1).

8. The appeal is dismissed with respect to Ranjay Yadav @ Niranjay Yadav (Appellant No. 1).

9. As far as other appellant are concerned, let the appellant nos. 2, 3 and 4 above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with the aforesaid case, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

10. Accordingly, the impugned order is set aside with respect to appellant nos. 2, 3 and 4 and the appeal stands allowed with respect to appellant nos. 2, 3 and 4.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

