

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60219 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-66 Year-2024 Thana- MEHANDIA District- Jehanabad

Nandlal Rajvanshi, son of Suryadayal Rajvanshi, village- Sabajpura, Ps-  
Mehandia, Dist- Arwal

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ramakant Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Gauri Shankar Gupta, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      26-10-2024                      Heard learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the  
  
petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the  
  
State.

2. The application for grant of bail to the petitioner  
who is in custody in connection with Mehandia P.S. Case No. 66  
of 2024 registered for the offence punishable under Sections  
323, 341, 307, 504, 506, 147 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Based upon the written report the prosecution  
alleges that on account of a dispute as has arisen due to playing  
a sound box in high volume, all the FIR named accused persons  
including the petitioner intercepted the informant and started  
abusing, in the mean while, one of the accused person has  
assaulted the informant by means of iron rod from his back side,  
due to which he sustained serious injury and became



unconscious.

4. Learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner contended that the alleged occurrence took place on 14.03.2024 and the FIR has been instituted on 18.03.2024 without there being any explanation for delay. It is further contended that even the narrations made in the FIR it would be evident that there is omnibus nature of allegation against all the FIR named accused persons. Moreover, the petitioner is in custody since 05.05.2024 and the investigation of the crime is complete. It is lastly contended that though the petitioner bears two criminal antecedent as has been disclosed in paragraph no.3, however, in both the cases the petitioner is on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State vehemently opposes the bail application and submits that the informant was brutally assaulted by the accused persons.

6. Regard being had to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and considering the omnibus nature of allegation and the investigation being complete and the chargesheet has been submitted, let the petitioner, named above, be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Arwal in



connection with Mehandia P.S. Case No. 66 of 2024, subject to the condition that one of the bailors will be the close relatives of the petitioner with further conditions which are as follows:-

(i) The petitioner will cooperate in conclusion of the trial.

(ii) He will remain present on each and every date of trial till disposal of the case.

(iii) He will not try to tamper with the evidence or intimidate the witnesses to delay the disposal of trial.

(iv) In the event of default of two consecutive dates without any cogent reason, his bail bonds will liable to be cancelled.

(v) The court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case, at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take immediate step for cancelling the bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds, in terms of the above-mentioned order, shall not be delayed for this purpose or in the name of verification.

**(Harish Kumar, J)**

supratim/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

