

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53824 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-98 Year-2025 Thana- NAVINAGAR District- Aurangabad

1. Ramdhani Singh son of Late Girdhari Singh R/o Village- Maigra, PS - Nabinagar, Dist- Aurangabad
2. Ranvijay Singh son of Ramdhani Singh R/o Village - Maigra, PS - Nabinagar, Dist - Aurangabad
3. Gautam Kumar @ Gautam Kumar Singh son of Ranvijay Singh R/o Village- Maigra, PS - Nabinagar, Dist- Aurangabad
4. Nandkishor Singh @ Nandkishor Kumar son of Ramdhani Singh R/o Village - Maigra, PS - Nabinagar, Dist- Aurangabad
5. Santosh Singh @ Santosh Kumar Singh son of Late Nemjad Singh @ Nemjat Singh R/o Village- Maigra, PS - Nabinagar, Dist- Aurangabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Santosh Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Dr. (Mr.) Ajeet Kumar, A.P.P.
For the Informant	:	Ms. Leelawati Kumari, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 23-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 109 and 352 of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on 28.03.2025 at about 06:00 p.m. all the accused persons including the petitioners came and started abusing



saying that why are you constructing the house. On objection, Ranvijay Singh (petitioner no. 2) along with his wife assaulted the husband of the informant by rod and lathi causing injury, when the family members intervened, petitioners no. 3, 2, 4 and 5 along with 10 unknown accused assaulted the informant's son with sharp edged weapons. Thereafter, Gautam Kumar (petitioner no. 3) assaulted the informant's younger son and Santosh Singh (petitioner no. 5) gave orders to shoot on which Gautam Kumar (petitioner no. 3) and Ranvijay Singh (petitioner no. 2) disagreed saying that the injured was already dead.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that petitioners and the informant are next door neighbours and are having dispute relating to land. It is next submitted that allegation of assault is not specific, though with regard to Gautam Kumar (petitioner no. 3), it is alleged that he assaulted the younger son of the informant, namely, Deepu Kumar indiscriminately. It is also submitted that from perusal of the injury report of Deepu Kumar, it would manifest that the same records that lacerated wound on the head of size length 2.5 cm, breadth $\frac{1}{2}$ cm, depth $\frac{1}{4}$ cm., pain and swelling of hand and the opinion with regard to



the injury has been reserved on which learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that since the opinion has been reserved, as such, the injury must be grievous and it is on vital part of the body.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that as far as injury of the informant is concerned, the same has been opined to be simple but then the opinion with regard to injury suffered by Bhagwan Singh and Manish Kumar has been reserved but then no specific allegation of assault is alleged against the petitioners of assaulting Bhagwan Singh and Manish Kumar.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant fairly submits that no doubt allegation of assault is not specific but then in the FIR there is specific allegation against Gautam Kumar (petitioner no. 3) of assaulting Deepu Kumar on vital part of his body and the opinion with regard to the injury has been reserved.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, this Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to Gautam Kumar (petitioner no. 3). Hence, his prayer for



anticipatory bail is rejected.

8. However, since no specific allegation of assault is alleged against rest of the petitioners, let the petitioners no. 1, 2, 4 and 5, above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/Successor Court in connection with Nabinagar P.S. Case No. 98 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

