IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Criminal Appeal (S.J.) No.909 of 2025
....

1. Asif Ansari, aged about 19 Years, Son of Adam Ansari
2. Aabid Ansari aged about 33 years, Son of Israfil Ansari
3. Javed Ansari aged about 32 years, Son of Israfil Ansari

All are Resident of Vill-Heth Balu, Balu, P.O.-Kokdoro, P.S.-Pithoria, District-Ranchi .... Appellants

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Butan Devi, aged about 45 years, Wife of Dhaneshwar Pahan, Resident of Vill-Heth Balu, P.O.-Sadkandu, P.S.-Pithoria, District-Ranchi

.... Respondents

....

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR

For the Appellants : Mr. A.K.Chaturvedi, Adv.
For the State : Mr. Fahad Allam, A.P.P.
For the Resp. No.2 : Mr. P.K.Shrivastava, Adv.

....

03/01.05.2026

1. The present appeal has been filed under Section 14-A of the Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act.

2. Heard learned counsel for the appellants and learned APP as well as learned counsel for the respondent No.2.

3. The present appeal is directed against the orders dated 11.07.2025 passed by the learned AJC-II-cum-Special Judge SC/ST Act, Ranchi in A.B.P. No.1578 of 2025 and A.B.P. No.1602 of 2025 and A.B.P. No.1621 of 2025 in connection with Pithoria P.S. Case No.39 of 2025, registered for the offence under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 299, 300, 126(2), 115(2), 109, 74, 352, 351(2)(3) of the B.N.S., 2023 and Section 3(1)(r)(s) of the SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, whereby and whereunder the prayer of the appellants for grant of anticipatory bail have been rejected. The case is presently pending before the court of learned AJC-II, Ranchi.

4. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the appellants that due to village politics this false and frivolous case has been lodged. Further, there is general and omnibus allegation. There is no specific allegation against these appellants. It has been further submitted that during investigation no material has come against these appellants. Further, there is an exaggeration as per the injury report, there is only complaint regarding body ache.

5. Learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for the victim has opposed the prayer and submitted that the poor section of the society has been

stopped for performing their religious rights. It attracts the SC/ST Act and as such the prohibitive mandate of Section 18 of the SC/ST Act gets attracted and anticipatory bail is not maintainable.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and from perusal of record, it appears that there is an allegation which attracts prohibitory mandate of Section 18 of the SC/ST Act, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the impugned order. Accordingly, this criminal appeal stands dismissed.

(Rajesh Kumar, J.)

01.05.2026
Shahid/
Uploaded on 04.05.2026