

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.3006 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-102 Year-2021 Thana- BHAGWANPUR HAT District- Siwan

Chandrasekhar Kumar Singh @ Chandrasekhar Singh S/o- Late Triloki Singh
Resident of village- Paniyadih PS- Bhagwanpur Hat Distt-Siwan

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ramawdhesh Ram S/o- Late Babulal Ram Village- Ratanpadauli Tiwari Tola
Ps- Bhagawanpur Hat Dist- Siwan

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Dr. Ranjeet Kumar, Advocate Mr. Kanishk Kaustubh, Advocate Ms. Lakshmi Kumari, Advocate Mr. Rajnish Prakash, Advocate Mr. Ankesh Kumar Sinha, Advocate Ms. Monisha Rathore, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Binay Krishna, Sp.PP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 23-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned
Special Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. An order, dated 06.06.2025, passed by learned 1st
Additional Sessions Court-Cum-Special Judge, Siwan, in ABP
No. 1374 of 2025, is under challenge in the present appeal
preferred under Section 14-A (2) of the Schedule Caste and
Schedule Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, whereby
the anticipatory bail application of the appellant in connection
with Bhagwanpur Hat Police Station Case No. 102 of 2021
registered for the offence punishable under Sections 302/34 of
the Indian Penal Code read with Sections 3 (2) (v) of the



Schedule Caste/Schedule Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, has been rejected.

3. As per the First Information Report dated 02.06.2020, at about 11:00 AM near the village of Paniyadih, the informant's son and brother were enquired on phone about their whereabouts and upon reaching to an orchard to discuss construction work found the appellant and other accused armed with rods and hockey sticks; it is alleged that co-accused Nitish Kumar questioned why they were not working in the construction of his house and used caste-based abuse, after which co-accused Jairam Singh purportedly directed the others to kill the informant's brother, and the appellant together with the other accused assaulted him on the head, causing grievous injury from which he subsequently died at Patna Medical College and Hospital.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant has not committed any offence in the manner alleged. There is general and omnibus allegation against the appellant. There is no independent witnesses to support the alleged incident and there is no proof that who has written the instant FIR neither any signature of any other person is there in the FIR nor the thumb impression of the informant is there on the FIR. It



has further been submitted that appellant was working as Electrician at Instakart Services Pvt. Ltd., Mirganj in the district of Gopalganj and has submitted the CCTV footage of his working place before the investigating officer.

5. Having regard to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the fact that there is direct allegation made in the FIR that the appellant along with other accused persons assaulted the informant's brother on his head by iron rod and the victim has died due to hemorrhage and shock by hard and blunt substance, I am not inclined to grant the appellant privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

Siwani/-

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

