

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13974 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-251 Year-2024 Thana- Mehendiya District- Arwal

Satyendra Chaudhary S/O Vijay Chaudhary R/O Village- Sohasa, P.S-
Mehandiya, Distt.- Arwal (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Aman Vishal, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Parmanand Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 19-03-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Mehandiya P.S. Case No. 251 of 2024 for the offences
punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 118(1), 109,
74, 352, 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. It has been alleged by the informant Virendra
Chaudhary that Rohit Chaudhary, Satyendra Chaudhary,
Dhanushdhari and Guddu Chaudhary came near the Mill and
Rohit and Guddu caught hold of the informant and both
assaulted the informant. When the father of the informant,
namely, Rajdeo Chaudhary came to the place of occurrence, the
petitioner is said to have assaulted him with shovel injuring his
hand causing fracture.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation of assault is against other persons. No specific allegation has been levelled against the petitioner that he has assaulted any other person. From perusal of the Annexure-2 which has been brought on record by the petitioner, there are three injury reports which are of one Virendra Chaudhary, Panpati Devi and Chhotu Lal respectively. All injuries are simple in nature. It has been stated by the learned counsel for the petitioner that contrary to the assertion made in the FIR, no injury report has been brought on record of Rajdeo Chaudhary confirming that he has a fractured hand caused due to the assault made by the petitioner. It has been specifically stated in para 10 of the petition that the allegation on petitioner of assaulting Rajdeo Chaudhary cannot be proved as there is no injury to substantiate such claim. There is also delay of two days in lodging of the FIR without giving any proper reason for the said delay which creates doubt on the prosecution story. The petitioner has clean antecedent and is in custody since 29.12.2024.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the bail application of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances,



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 Chief
Judicial Magistrate, Arwal (Bihar) in connection with
Mehandiya P.S. Case No. 251 of 2024.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

priyanka/-

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

