

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.1825 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-141 Year-2024 Thana- KATIHAR NAGAR District- Katihar

Vikash Kumar Singh S/O Shri Anant Bihari Singh R/O Village- Awadhpur,
P.O.- Dilarpur, P.S- Manihari, Dist.- Kathiar

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Patna
2. Dinesh Paswan S/O Late Gore Lal Paswan R/O Mohalla- Driver Tola, P.s.-
Katihar Nagar, Dist.- Katihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. Harsh Vardhan, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Sadanand Paswan, Spl. PP.
For the respondent no.2	:	Ms. Moni Kumari @ Reema Anand, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KHATIM REZA
ORAL ORDER

3 12-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned
counsel for respondent no.2 and learned Special Public
Prosecutor for the State.

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 bail vide order dated
17.04.2025 passed by the learned Special Judge (SC/ST Act)
cum the District and Additional Sessions Judge- 1st, Katihar in
connection with Katihar (Nagar) P.S. Case No. 141 of 2024
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 120-
B, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.



3. The case of the prosecution, in brief, is that informant's son was shot dead and one accused was caught. It is further alleged that a conspiracy for murder was hatched by the appellant along with other co-accused persons through hired killers.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that appellant is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. The appellant is a young boy aged about 22 years. There is no evidence of any overt act against the appellant. Learned counsel further submitted that there is only allegation that the appellant had transferred Rs. 3000/- in the account of landlord, Manish Kumar Mandal, in whose house the alleged criminals had stayed before committing the alleged crime on the request of co-accused Prasant Poddar and only because of that the appellant has been made accused in this case. Lastly, it has been submitted that the appellant has no criminal antecedents.

5. Learned Special Public Prosecutor for the State as well as learned counsel for respondent no.2 vehemently opposed the prayer of the appellant and submitted that there is allegation upon the appellant that he participated in the murder of the deceased along with other co-accused persons. From perusal of



confessional statement of co-accused persons, it appears that the appellant along with other co-accused persons conspired amongst themselves to get the deceased killed. All the witnesses have supported the case of the prosecution. Hence the appellant does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to grant bail to the appellant.

7. The impugned order dated 17.04.2025 passed in Katihar (Nagar) P.S. Case No. 141 of 2024 by the learned Special Judge (SC/ST Act) cum the District and Additional Sessions Judge- 1st, Katihar is hereby affirmed.

8. The appeal stands rejected.

(Khatim Reza, J)

Sankalp/-

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

