

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.164 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-774 Year-2025 Thana- SONEPUR District- Saran

=====

Chandra Kant @ Chandra Kant Kumar S/o Harendra Prasad Ray Resident of
Village- Bhinnik Tola, P.S.- Sonepur, Dist.- Saran

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Uma Shankar Chaudhary S/o Late Mundrika Chaudhary R/o Village-
Harnichak, P.S.- Beur, Dist.- Patna

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. Alok Kumar Alok, Adv
For the State	:	Mr. Binay Krishna, Spl. P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 16-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned
Spl.P.P. for the State.

2. No one appears on behalf of respondent no. 2.

3. This is an appeal under Sections 14(A)(2) against
refusal of the prayer for anticipatory bail by order dated
12.12.2025 passed by the learned Court of Exclusive Special
Judge, SC/ST Act, Chapra at Saran in connection with Sonepur
P.S. Case No. 774 of 2025 registered under Sections 319(2),
318(4), 316(2), 316(5), 61(2) BNS and Sections 3(1) (r), 3(1)
(s), 3(2) (va) SC/ST (POA) Act.

4. The case of the prosecution, in short, as per the



informant is that the informant and his wife were induced by Sunita Kumari (alias Chiku) and Janvi Kumari to purchase land in Sonapur through Anjani Kumar Singh. Initially, ₹16 lakhs was paid, part of which was refunded when the deal faced issues. Later, in conspiracy with Kamta Rai, they were shown another land, and substantial payments were made—₹8 lakhs via RTGS through Anjani and about ₹30 lakhs directly by the informant's wife to Kamta Rai. Further, ₹20 lakhs more was demanded, out of which ₹10 lakhs was paid in cash and ₹1 lakh online. After measurement and documentation, it was discovered that the land had already been sold earlier and did not belong to Kamta Rai. In total, about ₹49 lakhs was allegedly defrauded. Although Kamta Rai issued a cheque of ₹30 lakhs, it bounced. Later, when the informant confronted the accused, they allegedly abused him using caste name and threatened to kill him and his family and to implicate them in false cases.

5. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case due to dirty village politics and the biased intention. The entire prosecution story is false and concocted. He further submits that there is no specific allegation against the appellant and he has no criminal antecedent.



6. Learned Special Public Prosecutor for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant based upon the allegation made in the F.I.R.

7. From the allegations levelled in the FIR, it does not appear that there is any allegation against the appellant of having hurled any caste based abuse. His name appears to have come up simply because he happens to be present at the spot where the occurrence is alleged to have happened. There is also no allegation against the appellant of assaulting the informant. *Prima facie*, no case of SC/ST is made out against the appellant and also there is no specific allegation against the appellant of assaulting the informant,

8. Considering all these above-mentioned aspects, let the appellant, above named, in the event of his arrest to surrender before the Court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing each of them bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Court of Exclusive Special Judge, SC/ST Act, Chapra at Saran in connection with Sonapur P.S. Case No. 774 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.



8. Accordingly, the impugned order is set aside and
this appeal stands allowed.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

kiran/-

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

