

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18518 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-253 Year-2024 Thana- SINGHESHWAR District- Madhepura

Satrughan Yadav @ Shatrudhan Yadav S/O Late Gunjak Yadav @ Gujak Yadav R/O Vill.- Bhawanipur, ward no.-6, P.S.- Singheshwar, Dist.- Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ajit Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 02-04-2025 Heard Mr.Sanjay Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr.Ajit Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Singheshwar P.S.Case No.253 of 2024,FIR dated 23.07.2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2)/115/118(1)/109/303(2)/352/351(2),3(5) of the B.N.S.2023 (341/323/324/307/379/504/506/34 of IPC).

3. Allegation against the petitioner is that he caught hold hair of the informant and threw on the ground.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. Although the petitioner is not named in the FIR but from a bare



perusal of the FIR it appears that there is specific allegation of assault attributed against co-accused person, namely, Manish Kumar that he gave a spade blow on the husband of the informant and co-accused persons, namely, Lalan Yadav also assaulted with iron rod to the husband of the informant and co-accused person, namely, Raban Yadav and Avinash Yadav assaulted to the informant by iron rod and as per allegation in the FIR that the petitioner is the order-giver and apart from that, he also assaulted to the informant. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from a bare perusal of the FIR it appears that due to admitted land dispute the present occurrence had taken place. Although the injured persons have received injury and injury report of the injured persons suggests that the injuries are grievous in nature but the same was inflicted upon them by other co-accused persons.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is order-giver and apart from that, he also assaulted to the informant. Further submits that the petitioner carries two more cases other than the present one but fairly submits that the petitioner is on bail in both the cases, as mentioned in para-3 of the bail petition.



6. Considering the aforesaid facts, there is no specific allegation of any assault-overt act attributed against the petitioner rather there is specific allegation of assault attributed against other co-accused persons, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his 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 learned C.J.M., Madhepura in connection with Singheshwar P.S.Case No.253 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/ Section 482(2) of 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/her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his/her 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/her 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)

Nitesh/-

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

