

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.2697 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-295 Year-2022 Thana- PIPRA District- East Champaran

Aditya Kumar @ Aditya Son Of Pankaj Kumar Village- Tikuliya, P.S.- Pipra,  
Distt.- East Champaran

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ashok Ram Son Of Late Shanker Ram Village- Chitamanpur Khas Tola,  
P.S.- Pipra, Distt.- East Champaran

... .. Respondent/s

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                                                                                 |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Appellant/s  | : | Mr.Sharda Nand Mishra, Advocate<br>Mr. Sumit Suman Gupta, Advocate<br>Ms. Isha Mishra, Advocate |
| For the Respondent/s | : | Mr.Binay Krishna, Spl. P.P.                                                                     |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      11-11-2025                      Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned  
Spl. P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the Informant.

2. This appeal is preferred against the order dated 14.03.2024, passed by the learned Addl. Spl. Judge (SC/ST, Act), East Champaran, Motihari in ABP No. 929 of 2024, in connection with Pipra P.S. Case No. 295 of 2022, registered under Sections 341, 324, 307,504, 34 of the I.P.C. Section 25(1-b)a, 26, 27 and 35 of the Arms Act and Section 3(2)(v), 3(i)(r)(s) of SC/ST Act, whereby the prayer for Anticipatory bail of the Appellant has been rejected.

3. As per the prosecution case, the allegation against the appellant is that Appellant and other co-accused named in the F.I.R. fired on the informant and abused him



denoting his caste name.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant has falsely been implicated in this case and no offence under the provisions of SC/ST Act is made out in this case.

5. Learned counsel for the State and the informant have opposed the prayer of the appellants for grant of bail.

6. I have considered the submissions of the parties and perused the materials on record.

7. From reading of the F.I.R., it appears that the Appellant and other co-accused fired on the informant resultantly he sustained fire arm injury. From the allegations levelled against the appellant, I do not find it is fit case for Anticipatory bail and hold Anticipatory bail is not maintainable under the provisions of SC/ST Act.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts and and circumstances of the case, the prayer for grant of Anticipatory bail is rejected.

**(Sandeep Kumar, J)**

manish/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

