

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.3808 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-294 Year-2025 Thana- DEEPNAGAR District- Nalanda

K. D. Verma @ Ranjeet Kumar Son of Suresh Mahto Resident of
Village - Dumrawa, Police Station - Deep Nagar, District - Nalanda.

... .. Appellant

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sushila Devi Wife of Om Prakash Paswan Resident of Village -
Dumrawa, Police Station - Deep Nagar, District - Nalanda.

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Appellant	:	Mr.Krishna Pd. Singh, Sr. Advocate Mr.Tej Narayan Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mrs.Usha Kumari 1, Spl.PP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Rajesh Kumar Chaudhary, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

4 24-02-2026 Heard Mr. Krishna Prasad Singh, learned senior
counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant and learned
Spl.PP for the State duly assisted by Mr. Rajesh Kumar
Chaudhary, learned counsel for the informant/respondent no.
2.

2. The appellant has preferred the present appeal
under Section 14A(2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled
Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (hereinafter
referred to as “the Act”) against the refusal of prayer for
anticipatory bail vide order dated 27.08.2025 passed in



A.B.P. No. 1633/2025 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge – VI – cum – Special Judge, SC/ST (POA) Act, Bihar Sharif, Nalanda in connection with Deep Nagar P.S. Case No. 294 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 126(2), 103(i), 61(2) of the Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 (in short the “B.N.S.”); Section 25(1-b)a/26/35 of the Arms Act and section 3(1)(r)(s), 3(2) (va) of SC/ST (POA) Act.

3. As per FIR, eighteen (18) co-accused persons including the appellant alongwith some other unknown accused persons, each equipped with fire-arms/weapons trespassed to the house of the informant and committed murder of her daughter and nephew. Occurrence is alleged to be arising out of previous enmity surfaced due to quarrel amongst children of both communities.

4. Mr. Krishna Prasad Singh, learned senior counsel, while arguing on behalf of the appellant, submitted that appellant was the part of mob, where specific allegation to cause fatal fire-arm injury is available against co-accused Kaushal Kumar @ Kaliya and Prashant Kumar.



5. It is submitted by Mr. Singh that appellant implicated with this case out of community rivalry with the aid of section 190 of the B.N.S.S.

6. Arguing further, Mr. Singh submitted that allegation of abuse by taking caste name also not appears in public place. Mr. Singh relied upon the legal report of Hon'ble Supreme Court as available through **Hitesh Verma Vs. State of Uttarakhand** reported in **(2020) 10 SCC 710**.

7. Learned Special P.P. for the State duly assisted by Mr. Rajesh Kumar Chaudhary, learned counsel for the informant, while opposing the prayer of anticipatory bail of the appellant, submitted that it is a case of double murder where after criminal trespass, eighteen (18) accused persons including this appellant, who was also equipped with fire-arms, committed the murder of nephew and daughter of the informant.

8. It is submitted that informant is the eye witness of the occurrence and she categorically alleged that this appellant was also equipped with arms alongwith others, though he fairly submitted that allegation as to cause fatal



fire-arm injury is available against Kaushal Kumar @ Kaliya and Prashant Kumar.

9. It is also submitted that occurrence took place due to atrocities as defined with the meaning of the Act as the family of informant was the member of scheduled castes community. It is submitted that caste name abuse was made in public view.

10. It is further argued that even the regular bail of similar situated co-accused persons has been rejected by different learned coordinate Benches of this Court through Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 4102 of 2025 dated 22.01.2026; Cr. Appeal (SJ) No.3746 of 2025 dated 20.11.2025; Cr. Appeal (SJ) No.4121 of 2025 dated 29.01.2026; Cr. Appeal (SJ) No.4046 of 2025 dated 22.01.2026; and, therefore, as a matter of judicial parity, the anticipatory bail of the appellant be rejected.

11. It is pointed out that during course of investigation, different prosecution witnesses also supported the involvement of the appellant in the alleged occurrence and in support of this submission, learned counsel for the



informant drawn attention of this Court towards paragraph nos. 65, 66 & 67 of the case diary.

12. In view of aforesaid factual submission and by taking note of the fact as *prima-facie* appellant, being a part of the mob, appears actively involved in the occurrence and further alleged to be equipped with weapon, as per FIR, where informant is the eye witness of the occurrence, accordingly, prayer of anticipatory bail of the appellant stands rejected.

13. Accordingly, this appeal stands dismissed.

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J)

Rajeev/-

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

