

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.48 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-71 Year-2025 Thana- SC/ST District- Vaishali

-
1. Anil Singh @ Anil Kumar Singh Son of Nagendra Singh @ Sopal Singh. Resident of Village - Dauatpur, Chandi, P.S- Kajipur, Dist-Vaishali
 2. Anita Devi @ Arti Devi Wife of Anil Singh @ Anil Kumar Singh. Resident of Village - Dauatpur, Chandi, P.S- Kajipur, Dist-Vaishali

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Renu Devi wife of Lalkeshwar Ram Resident of village- Daulatpur, Chandi, P.O- Harauli, P.S. Kajipur, District- Vaishali.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. Jitendra Kumar Sagar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Binay Krishna, Special P.P.
For the Informant	:	Ms. Shifa Khan, Adv.
		Mr. Aman Kumar Singh, Adv.
		Mr. Parijat Karan, Adv.
		Ms. Shivani Roy, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 24-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the appellants, learned Special P.P. Mr. Binay Krishna 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 09.12.2025 in A.B.P. No. 2882/2025 passed by the learned Exclusive Special Judge-cum-Additional Sessions Judge, Vaishali at Hajipur, in connection with Hajipur SC/ST



P.S. Case No. 71 of 2025 registered under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 351(2), 352, 3(5) of the BNS as well as Sections 3(1)(r) (s) of the SC/ST Act.

3. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that appellants are persons with clean antecedent and appellant no.2 is a woman and the informant alleges that on 27.09.2025 at 8 P.M. her son and daughter was returning from a temple, when daughter of Anil (appellant no.1) assaulted them, accordingly, she came to the house of Anil when she was abused by taking caste name and was also assaulted and the injured were taken to the hospital.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants submits that appellants have 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 informant alleges that daughter of the appellants assaulted the daughter and son of informant, while they were returning home from a temple but then appellants were not present at the place of occurrence and when informant came to the house of the appellants, it is alleged that she was abused and assaulted. It is thus submitted that even presuming what has been alleged is true without admitting then the occurrence did



not take place in public view and allegation of assault and abuse is also general and omnibus in nature.

5. Learned Special Public Prosecutor and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the appellants, let the appellants, above named, in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of the order, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.5,000/- (rupees five thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending in connection with the aforesaid case, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the impugned order is set aside and this appeal stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

