

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9046 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-90 Year-2024 Thana- RAMPUR HARI District- Muzaffarpur

1. Sakindra Roy @ Satendra Kumar Son of Late Satyanarayan Roy Resident of Village - Dharampur, P.S. - Minapur, District - Muzaffarpur
2. Sunil Roy @ Sunil Kumar Son of Late Satyanarayan Ray Resident of Village - Dharampur, P.S. - Minapur, District - Muzaffarpur
3. Mukesh Roy Son of Late Satyanarayan Ray Resident of Village - Dharampur, P.S. - Minapur, District - Muzaffarpur
4. Manju Devi Wife of Late Satyanarayan Ray Resident of Village - Dharampur, P.S. - Minapur, District - Muzaffarpur
5. Ratiya Devi Wife of Yogendra Ray Resident of Village - Belaurpur Ghat, Jamaulia, P.S. - Bochaha, District - Muzaffarpur (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Meena Devi W/O-Nawal Kishore Rai, R/O-Vill-Muksudpur, PO-Hari Rampur, PS.-Meenapur, Dist- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arun Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Kumar Veerendra Narayan

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 14-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Rampur Hari P.S. Case No. 90 of 2024, F.I.R. dated 03.05.2024, for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 406, 424, 115, 120(B), 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. According to prosecution case, petitioners are alleged to have ousted the informant's mother from her land by falsely making sale deed.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have clean antecedents and they have falsely been implicated in the present case. The allegation as alleged in the F.I.R. is false and fabricated and the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged in the F.I.R. On the basis of complaint petition filed on behalf of the opposite party no. 2 and from perusal of the complaint petition/F.I.R, there is no specific allegation against these petitioners rather there is general and omnibus allegation against all the accused persons including these petitioners.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioners and submits that petitioners have committed crime in question.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, there is no specific allegation against these petitioners, let the petitioners, above named, in the event of arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned A.C.J.M., 9th Muzaffarpur East, District- Muzaffarpur in



connection with Rampur Hari P.S. Case No. 90 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure with other following conditions:-

i. Petitioners shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioners tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

iii. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioners have concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioners. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Ranjeet/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

