

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14602 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-373 Year-2024 Thana- BHAGWANPUR District- Begusarai

Sonu Kumar S/o- Late Dinesh Choudhary Village- Damodarpur Ward No.-7,
P.S.- Bhagwanpur Dist- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shubhesh Pandey, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Krishna Prabhat, Advocate
For the State	:	Mrs. Meena Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

5 24-06-2025 Heard Mr. Shubhesh Pandey, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, Mr. Krishna Prabhat, the learned counsel for the Informant and Mrs. Meena Singh, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Bhagwanpur P.S Case No. 373 of 2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 118(1), 352, 351(3), 109(1) and 3(5) of B.N.S. Petitioner has clean antecedent.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant has alleged that while he was returning to his house by scooty, the named accused person including the petitioner assaulted him by means of iron rod, lathi danda and with sharp edged weapon. It



has further been alleged that the petitioner had assaulted on the head of the informant by use of *garasa*, several times on his head and blood started coming out. It has next been submitted that the other co-accused persons also assaulted all over the body of the informant by lathi and danda with an intention to kill him. It has next been submitted that on alarm being raised, the accused persons managed to flee and the petitioner was subsequently taken to the Primary Health Centre (PHC), however, he was referred to Sadar Hospital but looking at the condition of the informant, he was taken to the Private Hospital, namely Prime Hospital.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case and no such incident as stated in the FIR has occurred. It has been submitted that the informant had fallen on his own while he was driving the scooty and false case has been lodged against the petitioner out of animosity and there was a dispute with regard to passage. It is next submitted that from perusal of the injury report, it would suffice that it does not contain the number of injuries sustained by the informant and also the nature of weapon which used in causing such injuries. It has next been submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedent and he is in



custody since 17.12.2024.

5. The learned counsel for the Informant as well as the Additional Public Prosecutor for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and has stated that from perusal of the medical report, it would suffice that the petitioner had suffered head injury on account of physical assault and the nature of injury were found to be grievous and from the X-ray report also there is fracture seen in the 1st proximal phalanx. The learned counsel for the Informant has further stated that there is specific allegation upon the petitioner to have assaulted the informant and as such he does not deserve the liberty of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions made by the parties and the nature of allegation and also considering the injury report, I am not inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail is rejected.

8. However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after six months in the meantime, the learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial of the case.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Siwani/-

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

