

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.54550 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-251 Year-2025 Thana- KHAIRA District- Jamui

Sunil Ram Son of Bhasho Ram R/o Village- Mango Bandar PS - Khaira Dist-
Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Mishra, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pranav Kumar, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 25-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2),
115(2), 118(1), 352, 351(2), 109(1) and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that six named accused persons including the petitioner
came and demolished his mud brick wall by JCB, on objection
the accused assaulted him. Further, Shailendra Rawat assaulted
the informant by an iron rod causing injury on his head.
Thereafter, Sunil Ram (petitioner) assaulted Narendra Ram by
lathi causing injury on his head. Further, accused put the straw
house of the informant on fire and the accused persons also
assaulted his mother and wife and Kisto Rawat snatched the



mobile of his wife.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that on account of dispute relating to land, an altercation had taken place in which both sides assaulted each other. It is next submitted that from the side of the petitioner Khaira P.S. Case No. 250 of 2025 was instituted against the side of the informant and others. It is also submitted that land purchased by Kisto Rawat upon which the informant had constructed the boundary wall had led to a dispute giving rise to the occurrence. It is submitted that it has been specifically pleaded at para 12 of the anticipatory bail application that injury caused to Narendra Ram, who is alleged to have been assaulted by the petitioner, has been opined to be simple in nature by the Doctor.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that though at para 12 it has been pleaded that injury suffered by Narendra Ram has been opined to be simple in nature but then neither the injury report is on record nor the order impugned records about the nature of injury.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned



counsel for the petitioner, let the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on provisional anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) 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 Khaira P.S. Case No. 251 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

7. It is made clear that thereafter the learned trial court shall verify the injury report of Narendra Ram and if it is found that injury suffered by Narendra Ram on head is opined to be grievous in that event the present provisional anticipatory bail shall not be confirmed but if it is found that the injury suffered by Narendra Ram on head is opined to be simple in nature in that event the provisional anticipatory bail shall be confirmed forthwith.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

