

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.639 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-803 Year-2025 Thana- ARA NAWADA District- Bhojpur

Jay Prakash Yadav @ Jay Prakash Kumar Son of Yogendra Prasad Singh @
Tindo Yadav R/o Village - Sri Tola, P.S. - Ara Nawada, Dist. - Bhojpur.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Raghuranjan Son of Ranjan Kumar R/o Village - Sri Tola, P.S. - Ara Nawada, Dist. - Bhojpur.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Ms. Malti Kumari

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Binay Krishna

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 06-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the appellant and the
learned Special P.P. for the State.

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 24.01.2026 in A.B.P. No. 19/2026 passed by the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge, SC/ST Act, Bhojpur at Ara in connection with Ara Nawada P.S. Case No. 803/2025, registered under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 126(2) 109(1), 115(2), 118(1), 352 and 351(3) of the BNS, 2023, Section 27 of the Arms act as well as Sections 3(2)(v) of



the SC/ST Act.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that appellant is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that he along with his brother Rishu and friends Akash and Ashish were having Golgappa at the bus-stand, when Pawan called and asked him to come inside the bus-stand, accordingly, the informant along with his brother and friends went inside the bus-stand where from before named accused persons including the appellant were present, further Pawan abused by taking caste name and said because of the informant is liquor business has suffered, thereafter Mantu and Rahul fired causing firearm injury on hand of Ashish, thereafter Bhola, Prakash and Anshu assaulted him and his brother by an iron rod and Bhola assaulted him rod causing injury on forehead, thereafter Prakash assaulted Rishu by rod causing injury on head and eyebrow.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that appellant has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that specific allegation of firing causing injury to Ashish is against Mantu and Rahul and Bhola is alleged to have assaulted the informant by rod causing injury on forehead and Prakash is alleged to have



assaulted Rishu by rod causing injury on head and eyebrow.

5. Learned Special Public Prosecutor opposes the appeal and submits that no doubt appellant is not alleged to have fired or assaulted the injured but then allegation is that Mantu along with Rahul fired causing firearm injury to Ashish and thereafter Bhola and Prakash assaulted informant and Rishu causing injury as recorded hereinabove. It is further submitted that presence of the appellant and other accused persons at the place of occurrence emboldened the other accused to commit the occurrence of firing and assault.

6. 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.

7. The appeal is hereby rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

