

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA  
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.3033 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-422 Year-2023 Thana- KARAHGAR District- Rohtas

1. Pappu Chaudhary S/o Lallu Chaudhary R/o Village and PO and PS- Kargahar, District- Rohtas
2. Ajay Chaudhary S/o Lallu Chaudhary R/o Village and PO and PS- Kargahar, District- Rohtas
3. Umesh Chaudhary S/o Kameshwar Chaudhary R/o Village and PO and PS- Kargahar, District- Rohtas
4. Pawan Kumar @ Pawan Chaudhary @ Pankaj Kumar @ Pankaj Chaudhary S/o Umesh Chaudhary R/o Village and PO and PS- Kargahar, District- Rohtas

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Vanshnarayn Ram S/o Bechu Ram R/o Village and PO and PS- Kargahar, District- Rohtas

... .. Respondent/s

**Appearance :**

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Ashwani Kumar Tiwary, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Binay Krishna, Spl.P.P.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA  
ORAL ORDER**

5      10-04-2026                      1. Heard learned counsel for the appellants and learned Special Public Prosecutor for the State.

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 21.01.2025 passed by the learned 17<sup>th</sup> Additional District & Sessions Judge-cum-Special Court, SC/ST Act, Rohtas at Sasaram in connection with Karaghar P.S. Case No. 422 of 2023 registered for the offences punishable under



Sections 147, 149, 341, 323, 307, 379, 504, 506 of the Indian Penal Code as well as Sections 3(i)(r)(s) of the SC/ST Act.

3. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that appellants have antecedent of two cases instituted by the side of the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the office report dated 19.03.2026, it would manifest that the same records that registered cover notice returned unserved with report of postal peon that respondent no. 2 has died.

4. It is next submitted that informant alleges that on 13.11.2023, at about 10:00 a.m., the informant along with Chatur Ram was going to do daily labour work when the FIR named accused persons stopped them near their house and started assaulting them with lathi and abused them by taking caste name. On alarm, Sudheshwar Ram and Santosh Ram came to their rescue when all the 13 named accused persons assaulted them with lathi and danda and also abused them and Dinesh Choudhary snatched gold locket from the neck of the informant.

5. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that appellants have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that 13 named accused persons have been implicated and are alleged to



have assaulted and abused by taking caste name but then the allegation of abuse and assault is general and omnibus in nature. It is next submitted that it does not appear probable that all 13 accused persons in one go would have abused the informant and others by taking caste name. It is also submitted that though it is alleged that Sudheshwar Ram and Santosh Ram were assaulted by the accused persons but then there is no injury report in the case diary and allegation of snatching gold locket is ornamental. It is further submitted that Sunil Kumar @ Golu Chaudhari along with two others had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 406 of 2025 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 09.12.2025.

6. Learned Special Public Prosecutor for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the appellants.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants, let the appellants, above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of the order, 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 in connection with the aforesaid



case, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

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

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

Kundan/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

