IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Criminal Appeal (S.J.) No. 690 of 2026

1.Kanilal Sahu, aged about 53 years, son of Late Harak Nath Sahu, Resident of Vill- Bhagalplur Mohalla, Bargain, P.O.- Lem, P.S.- Sadar, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand
2.Dhan Lal Sahu, aged about 70 years, son of Late Harak Nath Sahu, Resident of Vill- Bhagalpur Mohalla, Bargain, P.O.- Lem, P.S.-Sadar, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand
3.Ashok Sahu, aged about 37 years, son of Dhanlal Sahu, Resident of Vill- Bhagalpur Muhalla, Bargain, P.O.- Lem, P.S.- Sadar, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand
4. Sulendra Sahu aged about 50 years, son of Late Motilal Sahu, Resident of Vill- Bhagalpur Muhalla, Bargain, P.O.- Lem, P.S.-Sadar, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand
5.Machhendra Sahu, aged about 70 years, son of Late Motilal Sahu, Resident of Vill- Bhagalpur Muhalla, Bargain, P.O.- Lem, P.S- Sadar, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand
6.Kailash Sahu, aged about 66 years, son of Late Motilal Sahu, Resident of Vill-Bhagalpur Muhalla, Bargain, P.O.- Lem, P.S.- Sadar, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand ……..... **Appellant(s)**

Vrs.

1.The State of Jharkhand
2.Gaytri Devi, wife of Sri Raju Ram, aged about 50 years, Resident of Dr. Block, Q. No. -1, Near R.M.C.H campus, P.O- Bariyatu, P.S.- Bariyatu, District- Ranchi ..... **Respondent(s)**

…....

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR

For the Appellant(s) : Mr. Nitish Parth Sarathi, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Anup Pawan Topno, A.P.P.
For the Resp. No.2 : Mr. Shahid Khan, Advocate

I.A. No. 9411 of 2026

03/05.10.2026 The instant interlocutory application has been filed for condonation of delay of 97 days in preferring the present criminal appeal.

2. Since, it is a matter of liberty to the appellants, delay in filing the present criminal appeal is condoned.

3. I.A. No. 9411 of 2026 is allowed and accordingly, disposed of.

Criminal Appeal (S.J.) No. 690 of 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, learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for the Respondent No.2.

3. The appeal has been filed against the impugned order dated 04.12.2025 in A.B.P. No.3185 of 2025 passed by the learned A.J.C.-II-cum-Special Judge, SC/ST Act, Ranchi in connection with SC/ST P.S. Case No.61 of 2025, registered for the offence under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 352, 351(3) & 3(5) of the B.N.S. and under Section 3(1)(r)(s) of the SC/ST (PoA) Act. The case is presently pending in the court of the learned A.J.C.-II-cum-Special Judge, SC/ST Act, Ranchi.

4. Although Section 18 of the SC/ST (PoA) Act bars the grant of anticipatory bail, such embargo would not apply where no *prima facie* offence under the provisions of the Act is made out.

5. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the appellants that it is nothing but a product of rivalry politics rather a land dispute exists between the parties. It is further stated that the appellants have helped the other side and for helping the other side this false and frivolous case has been lodged against them. In fact, there is no cause of action rather as per the story disclosed, the victim- respondent no.2 had gone herself to interfere between the two parties. It has been further submitted that the co-accused namely Ramesh Kumar Sahu @ Ramesh Sahu has already been granted privilege of anticipatory bail in Criminal Appeal (SJ) No. 65 of 2026 by this Court vide order dated 11.06.2026. On the above basis, the prayer for anticipatory bail has been made.

6. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State and respondent no.2 have vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and it has been submitted that the alleged victim being the *Pradesh Adhyaksh* of the *Valmiki Samaj* had interfered in the scuffle between the parties and further allegation clearly disclose the commission of the offence under the SC/ST (PoA) Act. Consequently Section 18 of the SC/ST (PoA) Act bars the jurisdiction of this Court from granting anticipatory bail.

7. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and upon

perusal of the records, it appears that the alleged victim had herself intervened in the dispute between the parties. The materials available on record *prima facie* suggest that the victim voluntarily entered into the altercation and, during the course thereof, may have sustained certain injuries. *Prima facie*, therefore, it does not appear that she was targeted or subjected to the alleged acts on account of her membership of the Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe community; rather, her involvement arose from her own intervention in the ongoing scuffle.

8. Considering the above facts, the appellants, above named, are directed to surrender in the trial court within four weeks from the date of receipt/ production of the 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/- (Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each, to the satisfaction of learned A.J.C.-II-cum Special Judge, SC/ST Act, Ranchi in connection with SC/ST P.S. Case No.61 of 2025 on the conditions as laid down under Section ***482 B.N.S.S., 2023***. Further, the appellants will submit self-attested photocopy 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 the case without prior permission of the court.

9. In the result, the instant appeal stands allowed and disposed of.

(Rajesh Kumar, J.)

05 .10.2026
A. Mohanty

Uploaded
____/____/2026