

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.1546 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-912 Year-2025 Thana- AHYAPUR District- Muzaffarpur

Nakul Kumar Yadav S/o Parmeshwar Yadav Resident of village - Chitkundi
Bara, P.S - Mufassil (Bibiganj), District - Bhojpur

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Neetu Kumari D/o Late Ramnaresh Ram R/o Village - Brahmpura, P.S -
Paru, District - Muzaffarpur

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant	:	Mr. Ranjit Kumar, Advocate Mr. Sanjeet Kumar, Advocate Mr. Ugresh Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Ms. Usha Kumari 1, Spl.PP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Utpal Kant, 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.B.P. No. 4434 of 2025 arising out of a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 376, 313, 504, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) and 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, it is alleged that this appellant came in contact with the informant/Respondent No. 2 and on the false pretext of marriage, established physical relations with her and later on, refused to solemnize marriage, abused her with caste based slurs and threatened her not to disclose the ordeal to anyone.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant that appellant is quite innocent and has committed no offence. Appellant has falsely been implicated in this case only to pressurize him to solemnize marriage. It is further submitted that it is not the case of the prosecution that any member of public was present at the place of occurrence and as such, no case under the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act is made out against this appellant. Appellant claims clean antecedents.

5. On the other hand, 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 and submitted that appellant is named in the F.I.R. and there is specific accusation that on the false pretext of marriage, he established physical



relations with the informant and later on, refused to solemnize marriage and abused the informant/Respondent No. 2 with caste based slurs.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, specific and direct nature of accusation and gravity of offence, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the appellant is rejected and this appeal is dismissed.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashank/-

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

