

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.618 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-316 Year-2025 Thana- BAGHA District- West Champaran

-
-
1. Raj Kumar Yadav Son of Mishri Yadav Resident Of Village Nawka Tola(Teliya Tola), Ward No. 35, P.S. - Bagaha, Dist. - West. Champaran
 2. Rajdeo Yadav Son of Mishri Yadav Resident Of Village Nawka Tola(Teliya Tola), Ward No. 35, P.S. - Bagaha, Dist. - West. Champaran
 3. Ravindra Yadav Son of Mishri Yadav Resident Of Village Nawka Tola(Teliya Tola), Ward No. 35, P.S. - Bagaha, Dist. - West. Champaran
 4. Guddu Yadav Son of Mishri Yadav Resident Of Village Nawka Tola(Teliya Tola), Ward No. 35, P.S. - Bagaha, Dist. - West. Champaran
 5. Mannu Yadav @ Mantu Kumar Son of Mishri Yadav Resident Of Village Nawka Tola(Teliya Tola), Ward No. 35, P.S. - Bagaha, Dist. - West. Champaran

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Manju Devi Wife of Rudal Gord Resident Of Village Nawka Tola, Ward No. 35, P.S. - Bagaha, Dist. - West. Champaran

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr.Ram Kishun Prasad, Advocate Mr. Rajdeep Kumar, Advocates Mr. Nishant Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Sadanand Paswan, Special

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 15-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the appellants and learned Special P.P. for the State, Mr. Sadanand Paswan and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. This is an appeal under Section 14-A(2) of the 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 21.01.2026 in A.B.P. No. 30 of 2026 passed by the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge-cum-



Special Judge S.C./S.T. (POA) Act, West Champaran in connection with Bagaha P.S. Case No. 316 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109, 329(4), 74, 324(4), 352 and 3(5) of the BNS as well as Section 27 of the Arms Act and Sections 3(i)(r)(s), 3(2)(va) of the SC/ST Act.

3. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that appellant Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 have antecedent of one case, but then they were acquitted and appellant No. 5 is a person with clean antecedent, it is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant (Manju Devi) alleges that on 07.11.2025 at about 05:00 PM dispute arose amongst the children on account on which Sushil Gond was assaulted by accused persons, it is next alleged that side of the informant went to the house of the appellants for inquiring that as to why Sushil Gond was assaulted when it is alleged that the accused persons including the appellant assaulted the side of the informant and Raj kumar assaulted Shambu by *lathi* causing injury on head thereafter, Rajdeo assaulted by lathi on his leg, further Guddu by *lathi* assaulted Ajay who came to save



Shambhu and the accused persons also assaulted Karan and Mantu fired and Ravindra tore the saree and blouse of the informant and damaged the motorcycle and took out of Rs. 2,30,000/-.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants submits that appellants have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant on account of dispute relating to children, it is next submitted that no doubt a dispute had arisen amongst the children on account on which an altercation had taken place, but then it is submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant alleges that all the accused persons including the appellants came to her house and thereafter, committed the occurrence as recorded hereinabove, it is thus submitted that occurrence did not take place in public view and the injury suffered by the injured has been opined to be simple in nature and the blow is not alleged to be repeated, it is further submitted that as far as allegation of firing is alleged, the same is ornamental as no one was injured in the firing nor any empty cartridge was recovered from the place of occurrence, it is next



submitted that allegation of acting inappropriately with informant and snatching Rs. 2,30,000/- has been alleged only to give seriousness to the case.

5. Learned Special P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the appeal.

6. In view of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the appellants, the order dated 21.01.2026 **is hereby set aside** and the appellants above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand) each 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 Bagaha P.S. Case No. 316 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the appeal stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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



