

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.4751 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-39 Year-2025 Thana- MAHILA PS District- Gaya

Sukhdev Yadav @ Bhaglu Yadav S/O Late Ram Baran Yadav @ Late Badhan
Yadav Resident of Village - Tekuna, P.S. - Bodhgaya District-Gayaji.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Mamta Devi w/o Late Umesh Manjhi R/o Village Kachanpur, P.S.
Bodhgaya, District- Gayaji.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr.Ajit Ranjan Kumar
For the Respondent/s : Ms.Usha Kumari 1

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

- 4 06-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the appellant and the
learned Special Public Prosecutor for the State.
2. The appellant has challenged the order dated
18.10.2025 passed by the learned Exclusive Special Judge,
SC/ST (POA) Court, Gayaji in connection with ABP No.265 of
2025 arising out of Mahila P. S. Case No.39 of 2025, instituted
for the offences under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 74, 319(2),
318(4), 352, 3(5), of the B.N.S. and Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s),
3(1)(w)(i), 3(2)(va) of the Scheduled Castes & Scheduled Tribes
(Prevention of Atrocities) Act, whereby his prayer for grant of
anticipatory bail has been rejected.
3. The learned Special P.P. submits that in compliance



of the order dated 23.02.2026, the S.S.P., Gayaji was informed about the pendency of the instant appeal and was requested to inform the respondent no.2 about the same. It is also submitted that respondent no.2, despite being aware that the instant appeal is pending, chooses not to appear and contest.

4. In view of the submissions made by learned Special P.P. the notice is deemed to be validly served.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant submits that appellant is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on 21.07.2025 at about 8.00 A.M. she went for asking the due amount of Rs.14,000/- from the accused persons i.e. her brother in-law Pintu Manjhi, sister in-law Malti Devi and petitioner on which they started abusing and appellant assaulted and abused her by caste name.

6. 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 date of occurrence is 21.07.2025 and the FIR came to be instituted on 29.07.2025. It is next submitted that appellant is friend of Pintu Manjhi who is brother in-law of the informant and are having dispute relating to money, since appellant supports Pintu and Malti, hence he also came to be implicated with general and omnibus allegation.



It is next submitted that this perhaps explains why appellant despite receiving notice chooses not to appear and contest.

7. The learned Special P. P. opposes the bail application.

8. Regard being had to the aforesaid submissions, the order dated 18.10.2025 is set-aside.

9. The appeal stands allowed.

10. The appellant, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, is directed to be released on bail on his furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs.5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Exclusive Special Judge, SC/ST (POA) Court, Gayaji in connection with ABP No.265 of 2025 arising out of Mahila P. S. Case No.39 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

