

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47960 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-99 Year-2025 Thana- MANER District- Patna

=====

Pramod Kumar S/o Shyam Nandan Rai R/o Village- Bhaigu Tola, Byapur,
P.S.- Maner, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sanjiv Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Pronoti Singh, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Rabish Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 31-07-2025 Heard Mr. Sanjiv Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioner, Mr. Rabish Kumar learned counsel for the informant
and Mr. Pronoti Singh, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for
the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Maner P.S. Case No. 99 of 2025, F.I.R. dated
09.02.2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2),
126(2), 115(2), 109, 74, 303(2), 329(3), 324(2), 351(2) of the
BNS.

3. According to prosecution case, petitioner along
with other co-accused persons is said to have assaulted the
informant and his brother. It is further alleged that the accused
persons have abused female members of the family and also



looted Rs.20,000/- from the informant's house.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that it appears from the FIR itself that the present case is counter blast of Maner P.S. Case No. 98 of 2025 filed by the petitioner's side against the informant and their family members. It appears from both the FIRs that due to some petty dispute, the present occurrence has taken place. He further submits that although, the petitioner is named in the FIR, but there is no specific allegation of any assault or overt act attributed against this petitioner rather the allegation against the petitioner is that he along with other co-accused persons have assaulted the brother of the informant and he has received injury but his injury report suggests that injury is simple in nature and apart from that co-accused persons, namely, Kanti Devi @ Sumintra Devi and Muritiya Devi have been granted privilege of anticipatory bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 21.05.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 32629 of 2025 and another co-accused persons namely, Bhola Kumar, Police Rai, Yogendra Prasad, Ranjit Kumar and Mukhdeo Singh have been granted privilege of anticipatory bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Hon'ble Court



vide order dated 25.06.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 39630 of 2025.

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 and submits that the petitioner carries one more case other than the present one and apart from that he has actively participated in the present crime in question and he has assaulted the brother of the informant.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, there is no specific allegation of any assault or overt act attributed against this petitioner, injury report of the injured person suggests that injury is simple in nature and co-accused persons have been granted privilege of anticipatory bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Hon'ble Court, 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 the learned A.C.J.M., Danapur, District-Patna in connection with Maner P.S. Case No. 99 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. 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	
---	--	---	--

