IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Criminal Appeal (S.J) No.936 of 2026

Suraj Saw, aged about 30 years, Son of Late Dipak Saw, resident of Village Telmunga, P.O & P.S. Kasmar, District Bokaro

…. …. Appellant(s)

-Versus-

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Victim **…. …. Respondent(s)**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR

For the Appellant : Mr. Lalan Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the State : Mr. Nawin Kumar Singh, A.P.P

02/Dated: 24th September, 2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the appellant and the learned counsel for the State.

2. The present criminal appeal has been filed under Section 14 A of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act for grant of anticipatory bail though the same bars under Section 18 of the SC/ST (PoA) Act.

The present appeal has been filed against the order dated 19.08.2026 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-I-Bokaro in A.B.P No.465 of 2026 whereby the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the appellant has been rejected in connection with Kasmar P.S. Case No.24 of 2026, registered for the offence under Sections 115(2), 127(1), 74, 352, 351(1) of the BNS, 2023 and Sections 3(1)(r) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act. The case is now pending in the court of learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Bermo at Tenughat.

3. Since there is an issue of maintainability and as such, no notice is required to be issued to the victim/respondent No.02.

4. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the appellant that no offence under the SC/ST (PoA) Act is made out as it was not in a public view. There is a land dispute between the parties and only to take revenge, this false and frivolous case has been lodged. A counter case has also been lodged against the alleged victim and the parties are on litigating terms. On the above basis, prayer for anticipatory bail has been made.

5. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the appellant and has submitted that not only the offence under Section 3(2)(v) of the SC/ST (PoA) Act is made out. A female member of the weaker section of the society has also been humiliated. Further, the parties are known to each other.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and from perusal of the records, it appears that the offence under the SC/ST (PoA) Act is made out and as such, Section 18 of the said Act gets attracted.

7. In that view of the matter, I find no reason to interfere with the impugned order and grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the appellant. Accordingly, the present criminal appeal stands **dismissed**.

(Rajesh Kumar, J.)

Dated: 24th September, 2026
Raja/- Uploaded on 25.09.2026