

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.57915 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-80 Year-2025 Thana- SONBERSHA RAJ District- Saharsa

Jitendra Kumar Singh @ Puttan Singh S/o Late Madhusudan Prasad Singh
R/o village- 83 Hanuman Tola, Sonbarsa Raj, Ward no. 5, P.S - Sonbarsa Raj,
District - Saharsa

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajnish Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nirmal Kumar Sinha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 27-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 190, 191(2), 191(2), 191(3), 115(2), 119(1), 308(2), 308(3), 308(4), 303(2), 324(4), 351(2), 351(3) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. As per the FIR, the informant alleged that while conducting soil-levelling work on his land, the petitioner and his associates, along with about 200 goons, vandalized his warehouse, demanded extortion money, assaulted him with deadly weapons, looted cash and a gold chain, threatened to kill him and his family.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the



petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence, as he has been falsely implicated in this case. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. The matter arises out of a land dispute between the parties. Insofar as the allegation of being armed with *lathi* and *danda* is concerned, there is no supported materials suggested, and further, no such material has surfaced during the course of investigation. It is next been submitted that the injuries said to have been sustained during the scuffle are also non-grievous in nature. Besides this, it is the specific case of the petitioner that the land in question falls in the name of petitioner and entire efforts have been made to jeopardize his rights. There is no specific allegation which has been attributed to any of the accused persons. It has next been submitted that the allegation regarding snatching of gold chain and money is also incorrect and ornamental. According to the petitioner, the offences registered are triable by a Magistrate. In order to buttress the claim that the land belongs to this petitioner, he has produced documents showing that his name stands in the land possession certificate, along with the records pertaining to Jamabandi No.216117700081812. Be that as it may, prima facie this case appears to be purely of civil nature and from records it



also appears that the petitioner has also registered FIR before the police, but no action has been taken. The petitioner, however, has three criminal antecedents.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for the informant has also appeared and does not dispute the fact that the land in question belongs to the petitioner, therefore, the question of extortion does not arise.

6. Learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail to the petitioner but the factual position which appears on record is also not disputed.

7. Taking into account that the injury sustained by the injured is not grievous, let the above named petitioner, be released on bail, in the event of his/her arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned ACJM-II, Saharsa/Successor Court in connection with Sonbarsa P.S. Case No.80 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS as well as the following conditions:

(i) One of the bailors should be the family member/relative of the petitioner(s) who shall provide official



document to show his/her bona fide;

(ii) the petitioner(s) shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of his/her/their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds;

(iv) the petitioner(s) shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of their bail bonds.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

shikha/-

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

