

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Criminal Appeal (S.J.) No.282 of 2026

- 1. Sunil Singh aged about 27 years son of Motar Singh @ Matar Singh @ Madhusudan Singh
- 2. Motar Singh @ Matar Singh @ Madhusudan Singh aged about 53 years son of late Churi Singh @ Chandrika Singh
- 3. Tinku Singh aged about 27 years son of Dhanraj Singh
- 4. Deepak Singh aged about 35 years son of Bahadur Singh
- 5. Champa Devi aged about 48 years wife of Motor Singh @ Matar Singh @ Madhusudan Singh

All residents of Village – Mahadeodih, P.O.-Bharkatta, P.S. – Birni,
District – Giridih.

.... **Appellants**

Versus

- 1. The State of Jharkhand
- 2. XXXX wife of XXXX, Resident of Village – XXXX, P.O.-XXXX,
District – XXXX

.... **Respondents**

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR

For the Appellant : Mr. Shree Nivas Roy, Adv.
For the State : Mrs. Mohua Palit, A.P.P.

02/Dated: 07th May, 2026

- 1. The present appeal has been filed under Section 14-A of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act.
- 2. Heard learned counsel for the appellants and learned counsel for the State.
- 3. The appeal has been filed against the impugned order dated 09.12.2025 passed in A.B.P. No.2088 of 2025 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-I-cum-Special Judge SC/ST (PoA), Giridih in connection with Birni P.S. Case No.213 of 2024, registered for the offence under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 74, 76, 329(4), 303(2), 352, 351(2)(3) & 3(5) of B.N.S., 2023 and under Sections 3/4 of the SC/ST (PoA) Act. The case is presently pending in the court of the learned Additional Sessions Judge-I-cum-Special Judge, SC/ST (PoA) Act, Giridih.

4. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the appellants that earlier the appellants had been granted bail by the police. There is general and omnibus allegation against the appellants. On the above basis, prayer for anticipatory bail has been made.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and has submitted that the police after investigation had found the allegation true against the appellants, accordingly charge-sheet has been filed and cognizance has been taken and summon has been issued to the appellants.

6. From perusal of the records and submission made by the parties, this Court finds that there is offence under SC/ST (PoA) Act and as such mandate of Section 18 of the SC/ST (PoA) Act gets attracted which clearly bars the jurisdiction of the Court if the offence under SC/ST (PoA) Act is made out.

7. In that view of the matter, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the appellants. Accordingly, the present criminal appeal stands rejected.

(Rajesh Kumar, J.)

Dated: 07th May, 2026
Amar/-
Uploaded on 11.05.2026