

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.2771 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-166 Year-2025 Thana- JAMUI District- Jamui

1. Ranjana Devi S/O Damodar Mandal Village- Harla, P.S.- Jamui, Dist.- Jamui
2. Sachin Kumar S/O Damodar Mandal Village- Harla, P.S.- Jamui, Dist.- Jamui
3. Guriya @ Guriya Kumari D/O Damodar Mandal Village- Harla, P.S.- Jamui, Dist.- Jamui
4. Damodar Mandal S/O Late Balmiki Mandal Village- Harla, P.S.- Jamui, Dist.- Jamui
5. Sakunti Devi W/O Late Balimiki Mandal Village- Harla, P.S.- Jamui, Dist.- Jamui

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Nitu Devi Wife of Murari Paswan Resident of Village- Harla, P.S- Jamui, District- Jamui

... Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr.Rajnish Chandra
For the Respondent/s : Ms.Usha Kumari 1

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 30-04-2026 **1.** Heard learned counsel for the appellants and
learned Spl. P.P. for the State, Ms. Usha Kumari No. 1.

2. This is an appeal under Section 14-A(2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (hereinafter referred to as the “SC/ST Act”) against the refusal of prayer for anticipatory bail vide order dated 13-6-2025 in A.B.P. No. 801 of 2025 passed by the learned 1st District & Additional Sessions Judge, Jamui in connection with Jamui P.S. Case No. 166 of 2025 registered for



the offences punishable under Sections 190, 191(2) 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109, 76 and 352 of the BNS as well as Sections 3(i)(r), 3(i)(s) of the SC/ST Act.

3. No one appears on behalf of the respondent No. 2.

4. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the appellants are persons with clean antecedent and appellant nos. 1, 3 and 5 are women and the informant alleges that on 13-3-2025 at about 8 pm, all the accused persons including the appellants came to her house and started abusing by taking caste name, on objection Damodar Mandal gave orders to kill the brother-in-law of the informant, when all the accused persons started assaulting her brother-in-law by iron rod and knife and dashed him on the ground, further Sachin assaulted her brother-in-law by knife three times on head causing injury and when informant came to save him, Gado Mandal and Sachin dashed her on the ground and Ravi outraged her modesty and made video of the same.

5. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the appellants have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the same does not record any reason for the occurrence. It is further



submitted that from side of the appellants Jamui PS case No. 157 of 2025 dated 15-3-2025 was instituted against the informant and her side, as such the instant FIR came to be instituted by way of a counter-blast on 17-3-2025 alleging that the occurrence took place on 13-3-2025. It is also submitted that allegation of abuse is general and omnibus in nature, but then Sachin is alleged to have assaulted the brother-in-law of the informant by knife thrice on head causing injury on head, but then from the order impugned, it would manifest that brother-in-law suffered injury, which has been recorded as “1. Lacerated wound below left eye size 2”x1/4”x Muscle deep 2. Redness on left eye”. It is thus submitted that allegation of assault by knife on head gets belied from the injury report as recorded in the order impugned.

6. Learned Spl. P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the appellants.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts, let the appellants above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor



court in connection with the aforesaid case, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

