

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.2647 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-367 Year-2023 Thana- DHAKA District- East Champaran

Om Prakash Ranjan Son of Mahesh Ram village- Jhaua Ram Ps- Dhaka, Dist-
East champaran

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ruma Devi Wife of Yogendra Manjhi village and Po- Karsahia, Ps- Dhaka,
Dist- East champaran

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant	:	Mr. Anshul, Sr. Advocate Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent	:	Mr.Sadanand Paswan, Sp.P.P
For the Respondent No. 2	:	Mr. Suraj Kumar Tiwary, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

5 30-10-2025 Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned
counsel for the informant and learned Spl. P.P. for the State.

2. This is an appeal under Section 14A(2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 against the rejection of prayer of bail of the appellant vide order dated 23.05.2025 passed by the learned District and Sessions Judge, East Champaran in connection with Dhaka P.S. Case No. 367/2023 dated 02.07.2023 registered for the alleged offences punishable under Section 302 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3(2)(v) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Act.



3. As per the prosecution case, the appellant along with other miscreants is alleged to have committed murder of the informant's husband under conspiracy.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that no member of public was present at the relevant point of time of the incident and hence, no offence under provisions of SC/ST Act is made out against the appellant. Learned counsel has submitted that there is nothing against the appellant except suspicion. It is further submitted that the informant is not an eye witness neither any other witnesses have seen the appellant at the place of occurrence. The appellant has no criminal antecedents as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The appellant is in custody since 17.04.2025.

5. Learned Special Public Prosecutor for the State as well as learned counsel for the respondent no. 2 have opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant by submitting that before one day of recovery of the dead body, the informant's husband went with the appellant but he did not return and his dead body was recovered on 01.07.2023. As per the Post Mortem Report, the cause of death is shock and heamorrhage associated with vital



organ injuries, caused by sharp cutting substance.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the heinous nature of the allegation against the appellant, I am not inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 23.05.2025 passed by the learned District and Sessions Judge, East Champaran in connection with Dhaka P.S. Case No. 367/2023 and accordingly, the prayer for bail of the appellant is rejected and the learned court concerned is directed to conclude the trial of the appellant at the earliest.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

Atul/-

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

