

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.1022 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-47 Year-2025 Thana- SC/ST District- Rohtas

1. Mukesh kumar S/O Shri Niwas Ravani @ Shriniwas Prasad Resident of Village- ChorPokhar English, Post - Ganj Bhadsara, Police Station- Dinara, District- Rohtas.
2. Shriniwas Ravani@ Shriniwas Prasad S/o Late Janga Rawani@ Late Jang Bahadur Prasad Resident of Village- ChorPokhar English, Post - Ganj Bhadsara, Police Station- Dinara, District- Rohtas.
3. Ajeet Ravani@ Ajeet Kumar S/o Late Janga Rawani@ Late Jang Bahadur Prasad Resident of Village- ChorPokhar English, Post - Ganj Bhadsara, Police Station- Dinara, District- Rohtas.
4. Suryanarayan Prasad@Radha Mohan Ravani S/o Late Janga Rawani@ Late Jang Bahadur Prasad Resident of Village- ChorPokhar English, Post - Ganj Bhadsara, Police Station- Dinara, District- Rohtas.

... Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Bibha Devi W/o Ramashish Paswan Resident of Village ChorPokhar
English, Post Ganj Bhadsara, Police Station Dinara, Dist- Rohtas

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Dhananjay Kumar
For the Respondent/s : Ms. Usha Kumari 1- Spl.P.P.
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Laldev
Mr. Dhaneshwar Prasad Gupta

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 23-07-2026 1. Heard the learned counsel for the appellants, the
learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant and the
learned Special Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. In view of the grounds taken in the limitation application, the delay of 11 days in filing the appeal is condoned, hence I.A. No.01 of 2026 is allowed.

3. The appellants have challenged the order dated



27.11.2025 passed by the learned Special Court, SC/ST Act, Sasaram, Rohtas in connection with Rohtas SC/ST P. S. Case No.47 of 2025, instituted for the offences under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 303(2), 74, 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the B.N.S. and Section 3(i)(r)(s),3(i)(w),3(2)(va) of the Scheduled Castes & Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, whereby their prayer for grant of anticipatory bail has been rejected.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants submits that appellants are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on 04.07.2025 at 6.00 P.M., she saw the appellants digging soil in front of her house after putting a hut for tying the animals. On objection, accused abused by taking caste name and thereafter Ajit assaulted by lathi causing injury on palm and all the accused persons assaulted her husband and Mukesh snatched chain of her husband and threatened.

5. The learned counsel for the appellants submits that appellants have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant on account of dispute relating to passage. It is further submitted that allegation of abuse is general and omnibus in nature as it does not appear probable that all accused in one go would have abused the informant by taking caste name. It is also



submitted that the entire occurrence took place at the house of the informant, thus was not in public view.

6. The learned Special P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the appeal. The the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that specific allegation is alleged against Ajit assaulting the informant, who is a woman causing injury on palm and from perusal of the order impugned, it would manifest that injury has been opined to be grievous in nature.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the appeal is allowed in part with respect to appellant nos.1, 2 and 4 is set-aside.

8. The appellant nos.1, 2 and 4, above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of eight weeks, are directed to be released on bail on their furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs.5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Special Court, SC/ST Act, Sasaram, Rohtas in connection with Rohtas SC/ST P. S. Case No.47 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

9. So far as appellant no.3 is concerned, the Court is



not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the
appellant no.3, Ajeet Ravani @ Ajeet Kumar.

10. The prayer of the appellant no.3, Ajeet
Ravani @ Ajeet Kumar for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

