

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.28 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-17 Year-2023 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Supaul

SAURABH KUMAR YADAV @ SAURABH KUMAR S/O SURENDRA
YADAV RESIDENT OF BALWA PUNARWAS, WARD NO. 1, P.S. and
DISTRICT- SUPAUL

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. THE STATE OF BIHAR
2. KANCHAN KUMARI D/O LAKSHMI RAM, W/O SAURABH KUMAR
YADAV @ SAURABH KUMAR RESIDENT OF BALWA PUNARWAS,
WARD NO. 1, P.S. and DISTRICT- SUPAUL

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Nawal Kishor Singh
For the Respondent/s : Ms. Usha Kumari 1

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 15-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the appellant and the
learned Special PP for the State, Ms. Usha Kumari 1.

2. The appellant has challenged the order dated
02.09.2024 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-1st,
Supaul in connection with ABP No.763 of 2024 arising out of
SC/ST Complaint Case No.17 of 2023, instituted for the
offences under Sections 341, 323, 379, 498A, 494 and 506 of
the Indian Penal Code and Section 3(i)(w)(r)(s) of the
Scheduled Castes & Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities)
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 the appellant and the accused persons including the appellant after marriage started demanding Rs. 3 Lacs and threatened that if demand is not met, appellant's second marriage would be performed, further, the dispute was resolved by Supaul Mahila Police Station, but the accused persons again started demanding dowry, it is next alleged that all accused persons on 18.02.2022 abused her by taking caste name and ousted her from her matrimonial home and appellant was married to Sonali.

4. The learned counsel for the appellant next submits that Surendra Yadav and Punam Devi had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 4947 of 2024 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 22.04.2026, on which the learned Special PP submits that Surendra Yadav and Punam Devi were father-in-law and mother-in-law of the informant and order dated 22.04.2026 in Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 4947 of 2024 recorded that yardstick for considering anticipatory bail application of the appellants is different from the yardsticks to be adopted for considering anticipatory bail of Saurav.

5. The learned Special PP further submits that



allegation is of demand of dowry and the informant alleges that she was ousted from her matrimonial home and Saurav performed his second marriage with Sonali and from perusal of the pleadings made in the instant appeal, it would manifest that such specific allegation is not denied. It is also submitted that cognizance in the case has been taken, as such, a *prima facie* case under the SC/ST Act is made out.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the appellant.

7. Accordingly, the instant appeal stands rejected.

8. All the pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

