

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.1815 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-127 Year-2026 Thana- PAKRIDAYAL District- East Champaran

1. Vinesh Yadav @ Vinesh Rai @ Vinesh Kumar Yadav @ Dinesh Yadav Son of Jalim Rai @ Ram Janam Rai Resident of Village- Dumarbana Pakridayal, Ward No. 9, P.S.- Pakridayal, District- East Champaran
2. Ranjeet Yadav @ Ranjeet Kumar Yadav @ Ranjeet Rai @ Ranjit Kumar Son of Jalim Rai @ Ram Janam Rai Resident of Village- Dumarbana Pakridayal, Ward No. 9, P.S.- Pakridayal, District- East Champaran
3. Sunil Yadav @ Sunil Rai Son of Shri Rai @ Shri Bhagwan Rai @ Bhagawan Yadav Resident of Village- Dumarbana Pakridayal, Ward No. 9, P.S.- Pakridayal, District- East Champaran
4. Bala Yadav @ Bala Rai Son of Shri Rai @ Shri Bhagwan Rai @ Bhagwan Yadav Resident of Village- Dumarbana Pakridayal, Ward No. 9, P.S.- Pakridayal, District- East Champaran

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Geeta Devi Wife of Late Hari Paswan Resident of Village- Pakridayal, Ward No. 9, P.S.- Pakridayal, District- East Champaran

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Ms. Harsha Shashwat, Advocate
For the Resp. No. 2	:	Mr. Prateek Tandon, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Sadanand Paswan, Spl. P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 02-07-2026 Heard Ms. Harsha Shashwat, learned counsel appearing for the appellants, Mr. Prateek Tandon, learned counsel for the Respondent No. 2 and Mr. Sadanand Paswan, learned Special Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. This is an appeal under Sections 14(A)(ii) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act (hereinafter referred to as the “SC/ST Act”) against the refusal



of prayer for regular bail vide order dated 12.08.2025 passed by the learned Special Judge SC/ST, East Champaran, Motihari in connection with Pakaridayal P.S. Case No. 127 of 2026, F.I.R. dated 14.03.2026 registered under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 126(2), 115(2), 109(1), 118(1), 61(2), 76, 352, 351(2) of the B.N.S., 2023 and Sections 3(i)(r)(s)(w) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act.

3. Allegation against the appellants is that they along with other co-accused persons have assaulted to the informant due to which she sustained injuries.

4. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the appellants are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in the present case. She further submits that the allegations as alleged in the F.I.R. is false and fabricated and the appellants have not committed any offence as alleged in the F.I.R. From perusal of the F.I.R. it appears that the date of occurrence as alleged in the F.I.R. is 13.03.2026 but the F.I.R. was instituted on 14.03.2026 after delay of one day afterthought only to falsely implicate the appellants in the present case. Although there is specific allegation against the appellants that they have assaulted to the informant and she has received injury but from perusal of the impugned order it appears that she has not received any injury and apart from that the appellants have been made accused in the present case due to



admitted land dispute between the parties. She further submits that the police after investigation submitted chargesheet against the appellant and the appellant is in custody since 15.03.2026.

5. Learned counsel for the Respondent No. 2 as well as learned Special Public Prosecutor for the State, on the other hand, vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant and submits that the from perusal of the F.I.R. it appears that the appellants have participated in the crime in question and informant has received injury and apart from that appellant no. 1 carries twelve cases other than the present one, appellant no. 2 carries seven more cases other than the present one, appellant no. 3 carries three more cases other than the present one, appellant no. 4 carries three more cases other than the present one but fairly submits on the basis of paragraph-3 of the bail petition that all the appellants are on bail in the pending matters.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, let the appellants, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Special Judge SC/ST Act, East Champaran, Motihari in connection with Pakaridayal P.S. Case No. 127 of 2026, with the following conditions :-

(1) Appellants shall co-operate in the trial and shall be



properly represented on each and every date fixed by the Court and shall remain physically present as directed by the Court and on their absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, their bail bonds shall be cancelled by the Court below.

(2) If the appellants tamper with the evidence or the witness, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(3) And, further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the appellants and in case at any stage, it is found that the appellants have concealed their criminal antecedents, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the appellants. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

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

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Ibrar//-

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

