

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38106 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-6 Year-2025 Thana- SINDHIYA District- Samastipur

1. Chandeshwari Sada @ Kurel Sada S/o Mangal Sada Resident of Village- Rajghat, PS- Singhiya, District- Samastipur
2. Ram Chandra Yadav S/o Ram Chalittar Yadav @ Lakshman Yadav Resident of Village- Rajghat, PS- Singhiya, District- Samastipur
3. Saroj Yadav S/o Upendra Yadav Resident of Village- Rajghat, PS- Singhiya, District- Samastipur
4. Dhanoj Sada S/o Amarjeet Sada @ Jeetan Sada Resident of Village- Rajghat, PS- Singhiya, District- Samastipur
5. Amarjeet Sada S/o Baun Sada @ Baban Sada Resident of Village- Rajghat, PS- Singhiya, District- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ranjit Kumar Yadav, Advocate Mr. Ugresh Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Anil Prasad Singh, APP
For the Informant	:	Ms. Rasika, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 07-08-2025 Heard Mr. Ranjit Kumar Yadav, learned counsel for the petitioners, Mr. Anil Prasad Singh, learned APP for the State and Ms. Rasika, learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Singhiya P.S. Case No. 06 of 2025, F.I.R. dated 11.01.2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 223, 336(3), 338, 303(2), 352, 351(2), 3(5) of the BNS.

3. According to prosecution case, the petitioners along with other co-accused persons are said to have assaulted the



uncle of the informant. It is further alleged that some accused persons snatched mobile phone and Rs. 30,000/- cash from informant's uncle.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have clean antecedent and they have 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 petitioners have not committed any offences as alleged in the F.I.R. He further submits that although, the petitioners are named in the FIR, but there is no accusation against the petitioner in the FIR rather there is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner. The specific allegation of assault has been attributed against the co-accused persons, namely, Angad Yadav and Ravindra Yadav.

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

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the petitioners have clean antecedent, there is no specific allegation of any assault or overt act attributed against the petitioner and the specific allegation of assault has been attributed against the co-accused persons, let the petitioners,



above named, in the event of their 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) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Rosera in connection with Singhiya P.S. Case No. 06 of 2025, 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. Petitioners 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 their absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, their bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioners 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 petitioners and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioners have concealed their criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioners. 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	
---	--	---	--

