IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Criminal Appeal (SJ) No. 777 of 2024

1.Vikram Gope @ Bikram Kumar Gope, aged about 30 years, son of Bhagutu Gope, resident of Bhaktudih, Padugoda, P.O. & P.s.- Mahuda, District- Dhanbad.
2.Ranjeet Gope, aged about 31 years, son of Bhagutu Gope, resident of Bhaktudih, Radha Nagar, P.O. & P.S.- Mahuda, District- Dhanbad.
3.Anita Devi, aged about 41 years, Wife of Jagdish Ray, Resident of Bhagtudih, P.O. & P.S.- Mahuda, District- Dhanbad
4.Binod Rai @ Binod Kr. Ray, aged about 29 years, son of Amulya Ray, resident of Radha Nagar, P.O. & P.S.- Mahuda, District- Dhanbad
5.Vijay Gope @ Bijay Kumar Gope, aged about 43 years, son of Bhagutu Gope, Resident of Bhaktudih, Radha Nagar, P.O. & P.S.- Mahuda, District- Dhanbad
6.Lalita Devi, aged about 39 years W/o of Durga Ray, Resident of Bhaktudi, P.O. and P.S.- Mahuda, District- Dhanbad

…..... **Appellant**

Vrs.

1.The State of Jharkhand
2.Mahendra Ram, son of Dharmdev Ram, presently posted as Asistant Sub Inspector of Police, Mahuda P.S. Mahuda P.O. & P.S. Mahuda, District- Dhanbad and Permanently residing at Village Kharaunda, P.O.- Bailhana, P.S.- Kandi, District- Garhwa. ..... **Respondent(s)**

…....

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR

For the Appellant(s) : Mrs. J. Mazumdar, Advocate
Mr. Rohan Mazumdar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Pankaj Kumar, P.P.
For the Resp. No. 2 : Mr. Ashutosh Kumar Sinha, Advocate
Ms. Pushpanjali Kumari, Advocate

16/28.09.2026 Pursuant to order dated 07.09.2026, Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Sub Inspector, Mr. Abdul Kalam Ansari, Sub Inspector, Mr. Mahendra Ram, A.S.I. and Mr. Ravindra Kumar Yadav, Sub Inspector (now retired) are physically present before this Court.

2. The present appeal has been filed under Section 14(A) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 for grant of anticipatory bail.

3. Heard learned counsel for the appellants and learned counsel for the State as well as learned counsel for the victim-Respondent No.2.

4. The present appeal is directed against the order dated 18.07.2024 passed in M.C.A. No. 1634 of 2024 by the learned Special Judge (SC/ST Act), Dhanbad in connection with Mahuda P.S. Case No. 38 of 2024 registered for the offence under Sections 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 324, 325, 504,506, 307, 353 and 188 of the IPC and Section 3(1)(s) of the SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 whereby and whereunder the prayer of the appellants for grant of anticipatory bail has been rejected. The case is presently pending before the court of learned Special Judge (SC/ST Act), Dhanbad.

5. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the appellants that the there was a dispute between the parties and when the Police Party came there, some police personnel sustained injury during the scuffle. However, there was no intention on the part of the appellants to assault the police personnels, still, the men in Police uniform lodged a case under the SC/ST Act against the appellants, which is nothing but misuse of the protective provisions of the SC/ST Act.

6. The Police officials present in the Court today have, however, assured that they will remain vigilant in future.

7. Considering the fact that it is not a case under the SC/ST Act, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the appellants.

8. Accordingly, the appellants, above named, are directed to surrender before the learned Trial Court within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt/production of copy of this order and in the event of their arrest or surrender, they shall be enlarged on bail, on their furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Special Judge (SC/ST Act), Dhanbad in connection with Mahuda P.S. Case No. 38 of 2024 on the conditions as laid down under Section 482 of the B.N.S.S., 2023. Further, the appellants will submit self-attested photo copy of their Aadhaar Card and also submit their mobile number before the learned trial court which they will always keep active and will not change it during pendency of this case

without prior permission of the Court.

9. In the result, the present appeal is allowed and accordingly disposed of. Consequently, I.A. No. 9505 of 2026 also stands disposed of.

10. The personal appearance of the aforesaid police personnels is hereby dispensed with.

(Rajesh Kumar, J.)

28 .09.2026
A. Mohanty

Uploaded
____/____/2026