

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33710 of 2025

Arising out of PS. Case No.-155 Year-2024 Thana- MUNGER MUFFASIL District- Munger

Tulanand Ray, S/o Late Sudin Ray, Resident of Village- Tikarampur
Bhaiyaram Ray Tola, P.S.- Muffasil, District- Munger

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satish Chandra, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Renuka Ratnakar (APP 125)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 13-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case instituted for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 324, 307, 379 and 504 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant has alleged that while he was going to harvest the crops the named accused persons including the petitioner came there variously armed and started assaulting the informant. Thereafter, the petitioner is said to have shot on the temple of the informant with the pistol in his hand, however, he defended himself and then the bullet hit the informant's right arm.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further pointed out that there was a case and counter-case for the same occurrence and the allegation of firing against the petitioner hitting the right hand of the informant gets falsified by the injury report, which has been brought on record by way of Annexure-P3. From perusal of the same, it would be evident that there is no reference of any firearm injury while the injury sustained on the right hand was found to be simple in nature. It is also submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the injury sustained by the informant is not on the vital part of the body. It is lastly submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that there is one case against the petitioner which is prior to the present case.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions of learned counsel, the petitioner, above named, is directed to be released on anticipatory bail, in the event of arrest or surrender before the Court below within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-II/Concerned



Court, Munger in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 155 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure read with corresponding Section 482(2) of BNSS as well as subject to the following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors will be a close relative of the petitioner.

(ii) The petitioner will remain present on each and every date fixed by the Court below, if so required by the learned Trial Court.

(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 canceled by the Court concerned.

(iv) And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner except one above mentioned case 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 the same or in the name of verification.

7. It is made clear that the observations, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Vikash/-

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

