IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.176 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010028352026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-997 Year-2025 Thana- GAYA MUFASIL District- Gaya

==========

1. Sujit kumar @ Faram Son of Ashok Yadav R/o Village - Murkatta, P.S. - Muffasil, Dist. - Gaya Ji.
2. Sunil Kumar @ Sunil Yadav Son of Komal Yadav R/o Village - Murkatta, P.S. - Muffasil, Dist. - Gaya Ji.
3. Pintu Kumar @ Anil Yadav Son of Ram Lakhan Yadav R/o Village - Murkatta, P.S. - Muffasil, Dist. - Gaya Ji.

... ... Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Bablu Ravidas Son of Ramvriksh Ravidas

... ... Respondent/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Appellant/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Ms. Usha Kumari 1, Spl.P.P.

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

4 19-11-2026 Heard learned counsel for the appellants and learned Spl. P.P. for the State.

2. This is an appeal under 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 22.11.2025 in A.B.P. No. 290 of 2025 passed by the learned Exclusive Special Judge S.C./S.T. (POA) Act, Gaya Ji, in connection with Gaya Muffasil P.S. Case No. 997 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 352, 351(2), 74, 75,

WEB COPY

76, 303(2), 117(2), 351(4) & 3(5) of the B.N.S., under Section 27 of the Arms Act as well as Sections 3(1)(r) & 3(1)(s) of the SC/ST Act.

3. The case of the respondent based on complaint petition is that all the appellants being armed with weapon arrived and started abusing the complainant with caste name and it is further alleged that they have assaulted the complainant and his family members, specifically his wife. In last part of the complaint, it is alleged that the reason of the occurrence is that the complainant has put the articles of centering in the fields of the appellants to which they have opposed.

4. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the appellants are innocent and have committed no offence. They have falsely been implicated in this case. It has been submitted that from perusal of the complaint petition it will transpire that the date of occurrence is 07.07.2025 whereas the complaint was filed on 11.08.2025. There is no explanation for the delay. It has further been submitted that there is land dispute between the parties. The nature of allegation is general and omnibus and that nobody have received any injury.

5. Learned Spl. P.P. for the State opposes the appeal.

6. In view of the submissions made by the learned

WEB COPY

counsel for the appellants, the order dated 22.11.2025 in A.B.P. No. 290 of 2025 passed by the learned Exclusive Special Judge S.C./S.T. (POA) Act, Gaya Ji, in connection with Gaya Muffasil P.S. Case No. 997 of 2025 is hereby set aside and the appellants 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 bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each of them 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 Gaya Muffasil P.S. Case No. 997 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

7. Accordingly the appeal stands allowed.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

durgesh/-

U		T	

WEB COPY