

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.1103 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-200 Year-2024 Thana- FATEHPUR District- Gaya

Sano Yadav @ Sanu Yadav S/O Suresh Yadav @ Suresh Prasad Yadav R/O
Vill.- Manjhauli, P.S.- Fatehpur, Dist.- Gaya.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Arjun Manjhi S/O Late Bhade Manjhi R/O Vill.- Badki Kuhari, P.S.-
Fatehpur, Dist.- Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Vinod Kumar, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Ms. Usha Kumari 1, Special P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

6 13-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned
Special P.P. Ms. Usha Kumari No.1 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 08.10.2024 in A.B.P. No. 305 of 2024 passed by the
learned Special Judge, SC/ST, Gaya in connection with
Fatehpur P.S. Case No. 200 of 2024 registered under Sections
147, 149, 448, 341, 323, 427, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal
Code as well as Sections 3(1)(r)(s) of the SC/ST Act.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that from



perusal of the office report dated 02.07.2026, it would manifest that the notice was validly served upon the informant but then informant despite receiving notice chooses not to appear and contest. It is further submitted that appellant is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that eight named accused persons including the appellant came to his house on 05.04.2024 at 7.30 P.M. and assaulted causing injury on head.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that appellant has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that there is no specific allegation of abuse and as far as allegation of assault is alleged the same is also not specific rather is general and omnibus in nature and the entire occurrence took place at the house of the informant and thus was not in public view. It is thus submitted that this perhaps explains why informant despite receiving notice chooses not to appear and contest.

5. Learned Special Public Prosecutor opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the submissions, the order impugned is set aside. Let the appellant, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of the order, be



released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.5,000/- (rupees five thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending in connection with the aforesaid case, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

