

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.1485 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-110 Year-2025 Thana- Dehri Mufassil District- Rohtas

Mirdul Dubey @ Mirdul Kumar S/o Shobh Nath Dubey R/o Village -
Durgapur, P.S. - Dihari, Distt .- Rohtas.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ganauri Ram S/o Late Tegu Ram R/o Village - Durgapur, P.S. - Dihari,
Distt .- Rohtas.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant	:	Mr. Shivnandan Bharti, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Binay Krishna, Spl.PP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Babu Nandan Prasad, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 25-06-2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the appellant,

learned Special Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent-

State and learned counsel appearing for the

informant/Respondent No. 2.

2. This appeal has been filed for setting aside order dated 30.03.2026 passed in a case registered for the offence punishable under Section 106 of the B.N.S. and Section 3(2)(v) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, whereby the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail of this appellant has been rejected.

3. As per prosecution case, on 25.06.2026 at about



12 PM, son of informant, namely Sudhir Ram, was taken by Mridual Dubey to work as a laborer in the fields. At about 2 PM, while removing soil from a boring chamber, his son's foot slipped and he fell onto an electric wire due to which he got electrocuted.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant that appellant is quite innocent and has committed no offence. From bare perusal of the F.I.R. it is apparent that son of informant accidentally got electrocuted while removing soil and this appellant played no role. There is absolutely no allegation that this appellant abused the informant by caste name and as such, no case under the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act is made out against this appellant.

5. Learned Spl. P.P. appearing for the respondent-State and learned counsel appearing for the informant/Respondent No. 2 have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the appellant.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and general and omnibus nature of accusation, this appeal is allowed and the impugned order dated 30.03.2026 passed by the learned Exclusive Special Judge, SC/ST (POA) Act, Rohtas at



Sasaram in connection with Dehri (Muffasil) P.S. Case No. 110 of 2025 is hereby set aside with respect to this appellant only.

7. Accordingly, let the appellant, named above, in the event of arrest/surrender within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Exclusive Special Judge, SC/ST (POA) Act, Rohtas at Sasaram in connection with Dehri (Muffasil) P.S. Case No. 110 of 2025.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashank/-

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

