

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17303 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-146 Year-2024 Thana- GAIGHAT District- Muzaffarpur

1. Kanhaiya Kumar Singh @ Kanhai Kumar Singh Son of Uma Shankar Singh
Resident of Village - Sakarwara, P.O. - Sakarwara, P.S. - Gaighat, District -
Muzaffarpur
2. Naveen Kumar @ Naveen Kumar Singh Son of Uma Shankar Singh
Resident of Village - Sakarwara, P.O. - Sakarwara, P.S. - Gaighat, District -
Muzaffarpur
3. Kunal Kumar @ Kunal Singh Son of Rakesh Kumar Singh Resident of
Village - Sakarwara, P.O. - Sakarwara, P.S. - Gaighat, District - Muzaffarpur
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Chandra Shekhar Anand, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Murli Dhar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 24-04-2025 Heard Mr. Chandra Shekhar Anand, learned counsel

for the petitioners and Mr. Murli Dhar, learned Additional

Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in
connection with Gaighat P.S. Case No. 146 of 2024, F.I.R. dated
09.06.2024 for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323,
324, 307, 354, 354(B), 504, 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. According to prosecution case, the informant
alleged that the petitioners along with other co-accused persons
arrived at his poultry farm and abused and assaulted him.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that
petitioners have clean antecedent and they have falsely been



implicated in the present case. The allegations levelled against the petitioners are false and fabricated and petitioners have not committed the offence as alleged in the FIR and it appears from the FIR that due to land dispute the present occurrence has taken place. Although there is specific allegation against petitioner nos.2 & 3 that they caught hold of the informant and against petitioner no.1 had he assaulted the informant but the injury report of the informant suggest that injury is simple in nature cause by hard and blunt object.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioners.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, petitioners have clean antecedent and injury report of the injured person suggest that injury is simple in nature, 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 Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Muzaffarpur East in connection with Gaighat P.S. Case No. 146 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal



Procedure / Section 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita and 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 their absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, their 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 their 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)

Suruchi/-

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

