

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.4832 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-95 Year-2024 Thana- MANPUR District- Nalanda

Praduman Kumar Saw Son of Late Krishna Saw Resident of village - Manpur,
P.S. - Manpur, District - Nalanda

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Guriya Devi Wife of Ajay Chaudhary Resident of village - Manpur, P.S. -
Manpur, District - Nalanda

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. Rajnish Kumar
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Sadanand Paswan
		Mr. Ranjit Kumar Thakur

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 15-01-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the appellant, the learned

Special Public Prosecutor for the State and the learned counsel

appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The appellant has challenged the order dated
24.09.2024 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-VI-
cum-Special Judge, SC/ST (POA) Act, Nalanda, Bihar Sharif in
connection with ABP No.1481 of 2024 arising out of Manpur P.
S. Case No.95 of 2024, instituted for the offences under
Sections 341, 354B, 354D, 504, 506 of the Indian Penal Code,
Sections 3(1)(r)(s), 3(1)(w), 3(2)(va) of the Scheduled Castes &
Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act and Sections 67
and 67(A) of the Information Technology Act, whereby his



prayer for grant of anticipatory bail has been rejected.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant submits that appellant is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that she was married to Ajay Chaudhary in the Year 2009 and in the Year 2022, she came in contact with the appellant. It is next submitted that the relationship developed and the informant and the appellant established physical relation even and the appellant taking the informant in confidence even took some offer inappropriate photograph. It is further alleged that about two months thereafter her husband came to know about her relationship with the appellant, as such, she requested the appellant not to meet her, but he started threatening and even threatened that if she will not meet, he will send her inappropriate photograph to her husband and in the Year 2024, he sent her inappropriate photographs on the mobile of her husband. Accordingly, her husband asked him as to why he made his wife's photo viral on which the appellant abused him by taking caste name.

4. The learned counsel for the appellant submits that appellant has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the



relationship in between informant and the appellant was consensual and they even established physical relationship. It is next submitted that though the appellant sent inappropriate photograph of the informant on the mobile of her husband, but then, the mobile of her husband was never produced before the police. It is next submitted that had the mobile been produced before the police, in that event, it could have been confirmed whether appellant sent her inappropriate photograph to her husband or not. It is next submitted that as far as allegation of abusing the husband of the informant on mobile is alleged, the said allegation is exaggerated and even does not constitute an offence under the SC/ST (POA) Act as the abuse was not made in public view.

5. The learned Special P. P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the anticipatory bail application. The the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that though in the nature of allegation as alleged in the FIR, a case under SC/ST Act may not be made out, but then, it is submitted that informant specifically alleges that she was in relationship with the appellant and when her husband came to know about the relationship she requested the appellant to end the relationship,



but then, the appellant instead of ending the relationship made her life miserable by sending her photograph to her husband. It is further submitted that the appellant by his conduct ruined the life of the informant. It is also submitted that charge-sheet has been submitted.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the informant as well as learned Special P. P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the appellant.

7. The prayer of the appellant for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

