

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17843 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-61 Year-2024 Thana- PARSA District- Saran

Raju Rai @ Raju Ranjan Son of Harendra Prasad Ray @ Harendra Rai
Resident of Village - Saray Mujaffar, P.S. - Dariyapur, District - Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Brajesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Amitesh Kumar, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Kumar Ramesh Chandra, Advocate
Mr. Manish Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 16-06-2025 Heard Mr. Brajesh Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Kumar Ramesh Chandra, learned counsel for the informant as well as Mr. Amitesh Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Parsa P.S. Case No. 61 of 2024, F.I.R. dated 21.02.2024 for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 149, 341, 323, 307, 379 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. According to prosecution case, the petitioner along with other co-accused persons is said to have assaulted the informant with sword, rod, butt of the pistol, stick etc. It is further alleged that one co-accused person, namely, Surendra Rai, snatched gold chain from the informant's neck, one co-



accused person, namely, Shubham Kumar looted Rs. 53,000/- from the cash box of the shop and other co-accused persons looted a lot of articles from informant's shop. They also threatened the informant to kill on non-fulfillment of extortion money.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R. is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offences as alleged in the F.I.R. He further submits that although there is specific allegation against the petitioner in the FIR that he has assaulted the informant and informant has received injuries but injury report of the informant suggests that the injuries are simple in nature.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances that the petitioner has clean antecedent and injury report of the informant suggest that injuries are simple in nature, let the petitioner, 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) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-IX, Saran at Chapra in connection with Parsa P.S. Case No. 61 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/ 482 (2) of the BNSS, 2023 and with other following conditions:-

i. Petitioner 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 petitioner 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 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.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

priyanka/-

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

