

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.519 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-247 Year-2025 Thana- SAHPUR District- Bhojpur

=====

Anand Tiwari @ Anand Kumar Tiwari S/o Amarjeet Tiwari Resident of
Village - Barisvan, P.S.- Shahpur, District - Bhojpur

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Meena Devi W/o Ramjee Ram Resident of P.O - BarisWan, P.S.- Shahpur,
District - Bhojpur

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. Akanksha Malviya
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Binay Krishna
		Mr. Radhe Shyam Kumar
		Mr. Rajesh Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 16-07-2026 1. Heard the learned counsel for the appellant, the

learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant and

the learned Special Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The appellant has challenged the order dated
13.01.2026 passed by the learned 1st Additional Sessions
Judge-cum-Special Judge, SC/ST Act, Bhojpur at Ara in
connection with Shahpur P. S. Case No.247 of 2025,
instituted for the offences under Sections 126(2), 115(2),
118(1), 109(1), 352, 351(2), 3(5) and 103(1) of the B.N.S.
and Section 3(1)(r)(s), 3(2)(va), 3(1)(w) of the Scheduled
Castes & Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act,



1989, whereby his prayer for grant of anticipatory bail has been rejected.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant submits that appellant has antecedent of two cases.

4. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that Ankit Tiwari and another had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Appeal (S.J.) No.497 of 2026 and the same came to be rejected by an order dated 16.07.2026 after considering the case in detail and on merits. It is further submitted that case of the appellant is akin to the case of Ankit Tiwari and another.

5. The learned Special P.P. also does not dispute the said submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

6. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant is not in a position to rebut the said submission.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned Special P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the appellant.



8. The prayer of the appellant for anticipatory bail
stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

