

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI****Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 710 of 2025**

Manish Yadav @ Manish Kumar Yadav, aged about 19 years, son of Rambriksh Yadav, Resident Village Samdanala, P.O. and P.S.- Sakrigali, District- Sahebganj. .... Appellant

**Versus**

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Subodh Choudhary, son of not known to the appellant, resident of Sakrigali, Badi Bhagiyari, P.O. Sarkrigali, P.S. Taljhari, District Sahebganj. .... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRASAD**

For the Appellant : Mrs. Neeharika Mazumdar, Advocate  
 For the State : Mr. Sunil Kumar Dubey, APP  
 For the Informant : Mr. Pawan Kr. Choudhary, Advocate

**03/Dated:16<sup>th</sup> October, 2025**

This Criminal Appeal has been filed on behalf of the appellant challenging the order dated 28.07.2025 passed by Mr. Rajni Kant Pathak, learned Special Judge (SC/ST Court), Sahibganj in Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 379 of 2025, arising out of Taljhari P.S Case No.63 of 2025, instituted under sections 126(2), 115(2), 352, 303(2), 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 3(1)(s)/3(1)(x) of the Schedule Caste and Schedule Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act by which the prayer for Anticipatory Bail of the appellant has been rejected.

2. As per F.I.R, the appellant and four other unknown persons are alleged to have assaulted the Informant, causing injury on his head by bricks and stones and also abused him by the name of his Caste and snatched Rs. 10,000/- and the golden chain.

3. The learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the appellant is innocent and has committed no offence. It is submitted that the informant has only named the appellant in the

FIR along with four other unknown persons, but has failed to disclose the name of four other persons. It is further submitted that the injury sustained by the informant is simple in nature. It is further submitted that no particular caste name has been alleged in the FIR for abusing him by the appellant. It is further submitted that the appellant has got no criminal antecedent. It is submitted that the informant was unnecessarily abusing the appellant on 04.05.2025 at Sakrigali Railway Station by way of using filthy language. It is submitted that the informant was also ready to cooperate during the investigation and hence the appellant may be enlarged on Anticipatory Bail.

4. On the other hand, learned APP has opposed the prayer for bail. It is submitted that the appellant is named in the FIR and has assaulted the informant, causing injury on his person, which is supported by several witnesses and hence the prayer for Anticipatory Bail may be rejected.

5. Learned counsel for the informant, after adopting the submission learned APP, has further submitted that apart from the informant, subsequent statement of the informant was recorded at para-13 of the case diary and the statements of other witnesses namely Rita Devi at para-14, Vishal Kr. Choudhary at para-15, Shivam Kumar at para-38, Kaaru Mahalदार at para-82 and Fransis Kujur at para-83 of the case diary, wherein they have supported the case of the Informant for abusing him in the name of his caste. It is submitted that the informant was hospitalized for some days and he was treated at hospital and his rib was fractured. He has also undergone X-ray of skull and chest and hence the prayer for Anticipatory Bail of the appellant may be rejected.

6. Perused the FIR and case diary and considered the submissions of both sides.
7. It appears that the appellant is named in the FIR and he is alleged to have assaulted the informant, causing head injury.
8. It also appears from the injury report that the rib of the informant was fractured, though the injury was found simple in nature.
9. It appears from the statements of several witnesses namely Rita Devi at para-14, Vishal Kr. Choudhary at para-15, Shivam Kumar at para-38, Karu Mahalदार at para-82 and Fransis Kujur at para-83 that they have supported the allegations made against the appellant.
10. Thus, this Court finds that Anticipatory Bail of the appellant being devoid of merit and the same, is hereby, dismissed.
11. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 28.07.2025 passed by Mr. Rajni Kant Pathak, learned Special Judge (SC/ST Court), Sahibganj in Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 379 of 2025, arising out of Taljhari P.S Case No.63 of 2025 is upheld.
12. Thus, Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 710 of 2025 is dismissed.

**(Sanjay Prasad, J.)**

Dated: 16.10.2025  
RKM/-  
Uploaded on 08.12.25