

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**Cr. Appeal (S.J) No.694 of 2026**

-----

Uday Bhadra @ Hoda Bhadra, aged about 41 years, S/o Ashwini Bhadra,  
R/o Village Kanaipur, Post Bon Mohurapur, P.S. Murarai, District  
Birbhum (West Bengal) ..... **Appellant(s).**

**Versus**

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Budhwa Paharia, S/o Late Dukhu Paharia, R/o Village & Post-  
Dhanushpuja, P.S. Maheshpur, District Pakur, Jharkhand

..... **Respondents**

-----

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR**

|                      |                                                                   |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Appellant(s) | : Mr. Pradeep Kumar Nayak, Advocate<br>Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate |
| For the State        | : Mr. Manoj Kumar Mishra, APP                                     |

-----

**Order No.03/ Dated: 9<sup>th</sup> September, 2026**

1. Heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned APP for the State.
2. The present appeal has been filed under Section 14-A of the Scheduled Castes/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 09.06.2026, passed by the court of learned Special Judge, SC/ST (PoA) Act, Pakur in A.B.P No.240 of 2026, whereby the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the appellant has been rejected in connection with Maheshpur P.S. Case No.19 of 2026, registered for the offence under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 352, 351(2), 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023 and Sections 3(1)(r) and 3(1)(s) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act.

3. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the appellant that there is no abusement to the victim and no offence under the SC/ST Act is made out. On the above basis, prayer for anticipatory bail has been made.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that since there is a scheduled offence and the parties were known to each other, Section 18 of the SC/ST Act gets activated.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and from perusal of the record, it appears that the scheduled offence is made out. Both parties were known to each other, accordingly, Section 18 of the SC/ST Act gets attracted. The learned Trial Court has rightly held that the anticipatory bail is not maintainable.

6. Considering the above facts, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the appellant.

7. In the result, the appeal is, hereby, dismissed and accordingly disposed of.

**(Rajesh Kumar, J.)**

9<sup>th</sup> September, 2026  
Madhav/-  
Uploaded on:10.09.2026