

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11242 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-19 Year-2024 Thana- Bankebazar District- Gaya

Manish Manjhi @ Manish Kumar S/o Nageshwar Bhuiyan R/o Vill -
Sondaha, P.S.- Bankebazar, Distt.- Gaya, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shailesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 18-06-2025 Heard Mr. Shailesh Kumar Singh, the learned counsel
appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mr. Shailendra Kumar
Singh, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 302, 120(B) and
34 of the Indian Penal Code. Petitioner has clean antecedent.

3. The prosecution case is to the effect that the
informant has alleged that she came at the house of her sister-in-
law, namely Rubi Devi on 04.04.2024 as there was differences,
due to the construction of a house, with the other accused,
namely, Balesh Manjhi, Sakeena Manjhi, Manish Manjhi
(petitioner), Jamuna Manjhi and Basmati Devi. It has further
been alleged that while the husband of the informant along with
his niece were returning, the accused persons including the
petitioner had chased them on a motorcycle and attacked the



husband of the informant hitting him on his neck upon which her husband fell down from the motorcycle. It is further alleged that the petitioner brought her husband to the hospital and thereafter fled away.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from mere perusal of the F.I.R., it would be evident that petitioner had helped the husband of the informant when he received injuries and had brought him to the hospital and thus his conduct does not show that he was the person who had assaulted the husband of the informant. The learned counsel further submits that there is no eye-witness to the occurrence and during the course of investigation, independent witnesses has stated about the husband of the informant meeting with an accident and he was taken to the hospital by the petitioner himself. The learned counsel has next submitted that the specific allegation levelled against the petitioner of assault is an exaggeration and the police had already submitted the chargesheet. The learned counsel has drawn the attention of this Court towards the postmortem report wherein no injury on the neck as alleged in the F.I.R. was found and from perusal of the postmortem report, one could find that there was blood clot in the frontal parietal region of the brain which has ultimately



caused the death of the husband of the informant. Lastly, it has been submitted that petitioner has clean antecedent and is in custody since 23.07.2024.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and has stated that there is admittedly a dispute between the petitioner and the informant's family. On account of such dispute, the petitioner is alleged to have assaulted the husband of the informant and killed him.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made by the parties, I am inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of regular bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail is allowed.

8. Let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection Bankebazar P.S. Case No. 19 of 2024, subject to the following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his close relative and the other shall be local resident.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present in



Court on each date of the trial.

(iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioner will be liable to be cancelled by the court concerned.

(iv) The learned 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 step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. 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.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Siwani/-

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

