

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.5020 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-89 Year-2025 Thana- BANSHI District- Jehanabad

=====

Ranjeet Kumar @ Dr. Ranjeet Kumar Yadav S/o Dwarik Singh R/o Village -
Mahuabag, P.S - Karpi, District - Arwal

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Yamuna Das S/o Late Indradeo Das R/o Village - Kishunpur, P.S - Banshi,
District - Arwal

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Anuj Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sadanand Paswan, Special PP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 16-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the appellant and
learned Special P.P. for the State, Mr. Sadanand Paswan.

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 28.11.2025 in A.B.P. No. 1653 of 2025 passed by
the learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge
S.C./S.T. (POA) Act, Jehanabad in connection with Banshi P.S.
Case No. 89 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable
under Sections 105 and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 as well as
Sections 3(1)(r)(s) and 3(2)(va) 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 second daughter-in-law was pregnant and he was returning after getting her ultrasound done when he met Dr. Ranjeet Kumar Yadav (appellant) who was working with Aditya hospital, further appellant after seeing the ultrasound report advised that the delivery would be normal and thereafter called the informant at his Ghazipur residence where he was running a clinic and thereafter got the victim admitted, it is next alleged that on 14.09.2025 at 05:00 PM, the victim was admitted in the clinic of the appellant and on 15.09.2025, the victim was operated and the child was delivered, but then the condition of the victim deteriorated, it is also alleged that the appellant asked his elder daughter-in-law about her caste and asked her to arrange money, accordingly his elder daughter-in-law went to Sonbhadra for arranging money and the appellant on the pretext of getting medicine also went to Sonbhadra, it is next alleged that thereafter the appellant came to his Ghazipur clinic and ousted the victim out of the clinic and fled with his compounder and wife, it is further alleged that when informant along with elder daughter-in-law came to the clinic of the appellant at Ghazipur, they saw the dead body of the victim.



4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that appellant has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that appellant is not a doctor rather is a dresser. It is also submitted that Aditya hospital is not run by the appellant nor he works as a doctor at Aditya hospital, since he is a dresser. It is further submitted that appellant never met the informant nor got the victim admitted in his clinic at Ghazipur. It is also submitted that for reasons best known, the informant implicated the appellant in the instant case.

5. Learned Special P.P. for the State opposes the appeal and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that the second daughter-in-law of the informant died. It is also submitted that there is a specific allegation against the appellant in the FIR that he worked as a doctor at Aditya hospital and in that connection had met the informant and had advised for a normal delivery after seeing the ultrasound report and thereafter got the victim admitted at his Ghazipur clinic. It is next submitted that from pleadings made in the appeal, it would manifest that the informant has not disputed or denied the allegation that he does not work with Aditya hospital. It is further submitted that though appellant accepts that he is not a doctor but a dresser, but then there is a specific



allegation against him that he got the daughter-in-law of the informant admitted in his clinic which he was running at Ghazipur and when the condition of the victim deteriorated after delivery of the child born based on cesarean operation, it appears that the appellant was not in a position to handle the same and thus the victim died. It is also submitted that in rural areas, the practice is prevalent that quacks in large numbers fish clients for such purposes. It is also submitted that investigation of the case is continuing and if the appellant is innocent, final form would be submitted, but then is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

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 appeal stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

