

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47449 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-40 Year-2025 Thana- Sonki District- Darbhanga

Ram Pukar Sahu @ Ram Pukar Sah Son of Late Thakko Sahu R/V- Rasalpur
Sahila, P.S.- Sonki, Dist.- Darbhanga

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ajay Kumar, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Uma Shankar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Anil Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 31-07-2025 Heard Mr. Ajay Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Uma Shankar Singh, learned counsel for the Informant and Mr. Anil Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Sonki P.S. Case No. 40 of 2025, F.I.R. dated 12.03.2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 308(3), 351(2) and 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023.

3. As per the First Information Report, the informant alleged that the petitioner along with other accused persons took money from him in lieu of registration of sale deed of land but did not do so. When the informant demanded the money back, the accused persons did not return the money instead demanded Rs.10 lakh as *rangdari*.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. From bare perusal of the FIR it appears that petitioner has not received any amount from the informant and the informant has paid the amount in question to one co-accused person, namely, Baidyanath Mukhiya and in lieu of that Baidyanath Mukhiya has executed some land in favour of the informant and at best the petitioner is the witness of the agreement for sale and except the aforesaid, no other cogent material has come during investigation which suggest the involvement of the petitioner in the present occurrence.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for the Informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the Informant submits that petitioner is one of the witness of the agreement for the sale.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the petitioner has clean antecedent and he has not received any amount from the informant and co-accused has executed some land in favour of the informant, 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 A.C.J.M. 1st, Darbhanga in connection



with Sonki P.S. Case No. 40 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure / Section 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 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 bond in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Suruchi/-

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

