

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No. 5612 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-332 Year-2024 Thana- SAHPUR District- Patna

=====

Dinesh Sao @ Dinesh Kumar Son of Late Sudeshwar Sao Resident of Village-
Nasirchak, P.S.- Shahpur, Distt.- Patna

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

- 1. The State of Bihar
- 2. Arjun Choudhary Son of Late Foujdari Choudhary Resident of Anishabad,
P.S.- Gardanibagh, Distt.- Patna

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. Ganesh Prasad Yadav
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Sadanand Paswan, Spl. PP
		Mr. Sanjeev Sharan, Advocate
		Mr. Aditya Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 27-01-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the appellant; learned
Spl. P.P. for the State, Sri Sadanand Paswan and the learned
counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

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 21-11-2024 in A.B.P. No. 4598 of 2024 passed by
the learned Exclusive Special Judge S.C./S.T. (POA) Act, Sadar
Patna in connection with Shahpur P.S. Case No. 332 of 2024
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2),
115(2), 308(3), 353, 351(2), and 3(5) of BNS Code as well as
Sections 3(1)(r)(s) of the SC/ST Act.



3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that appellant is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that his ancestor had purchased a piece of land at Mauza Khedalpura, further on 1-10-2024 son of ex-MLA along with named accused persons came on the land and started demolishing the boundary wall by JCB machine and he came to know about the occurrence which was captured by the CCTV installed at the land, further when he reached the place of occurrence, on orders of Sachchidnand, appellant, Bajrangi and Ramu abused him by caste name and demanded extortion of Rs. 10 lakh.

4. 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 on account of dispute relating to land, the occurrence is alleged to have taken place. It is further submitted that the thrust of the allegation is against the son of ex-MLA, who is alleged to have come to the place of occurrence with JCB machine and got the boundary wall demolished.

5. Learned Spl. PP and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the appeal. The learned



counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that it was this appellant who was trying to usurp the land of the informant for which he had also filed a title suit, but when written statement was filed by the informant, the appellant left the suit, as such it was dismissed for non-prosecution, it was thereafter that at the behest of the appellant the occurrence was committed and the entire occurrence was captured in the CCTV installed at the place of occurrence. It is also submitted that there is a specific allegation against the appellant and others of abusing the informant by caste name at the place of occurrence which was in public view. It is next submitted that police after investigation has submitted charge-sheet. It is further submitted that appellant in the instant appeal has not even remotely suggested that the occurrence was not captured in the CCTV.

6. Considering the submission made by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the appellant.

7. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

