

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.2680 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-96 Year-2025 Thana- MESKAUR District- Nawada

Pintu Kumar @ Pintu Singh S/O Jairam Singh Village- Dhobi Bisiyait, P.S.-
Meskaur, Dist.- Nawada.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Jayanti Devi W/O Late Satyendra Manjhi @ Sabinder Manjhi Village-
Dhobni, P.S.- Meskaur, Dist.- Nawada.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Subodh Kumar Barnwal, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Binay Krishna, SPP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 09-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned
Special Public Prosecutor for the State

2. The instant appeal has been filed by the appellant against the order dated 21.06.2025 passed by learned Exclusive Special Judge-cum-Special Court SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, Nawada whereby the prayer for anticipatory bail of the appellant in connection with Meskaur P.S. Case No. 96 of 2025 under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, read with Sections 3(1)(r)(s) and 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act was rejected.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that on 09.05.2025, the accused brought her injured husband home at midnight,



stating that he had fallen into a ditch and received treatment at a clinic. The next morning, when he complained of severe head pain, she took him to the PHC where he was declared dead. Believing the explanation to be false, the informant suspects that the accused persons assaulted her husband, causing his death.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Learned counsel for the appellant also submitted that no specific allegation of assault has been attributed against the appellant rather the same is general and omnibus in nature, so far as injury is concerned, the deceased sustained the injury while he fell into the ditch. Learned counsel for the appellant further submitted that the appellant has not taken the caste name of the informant in public view. Hence, no offence under the provisions of SC/ST Act is made out against him. The appellant has no intention to disgrace the image of the informant in public view. The appellant has got no criminal antecedent. Other co-accused has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 27.11.2025 passed in Cr. Appeal (S.J.) No. 3755 of 2025.

5. Learned Special P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the appellant and submitted that the appellant is named in the FIR and there is



specific allegation levelled against the appellant. Hence, the appellant does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, specific allegation as also nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the appellant at this juncture.

7. Accordingly, the appeal stands dismissed.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

