

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.56628 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-56 Year-2016 Thana- SUGAULI District- East Champaran

Pundev Mahto S/o Ramlakhan Mahto R/o Village- Sripur Tola Gopalpur, P.S.-
Sugauli, District- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dhannjay Kumar II, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nand Kishore Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 19-08-2025 Heard Mr. Dhannjay Kumar, learned counsel for the
Petitioner and Mr. Nand Kishore Prasad, learned APP for the State.

2. As per the prosecution's story, this petitioner assaulted the informant by means of Farsa causing cut injury on his head as a result of which he fell down on the ground.

3. Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Sugauli P.S. Case No. 56 of 2016 dated 25.02.2016 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 324, 307, 379, 504 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

4 The main submissions advanced by the petitioner's counsel are that the alleged occurrence is said to have taken place on 21.01.2016 but the FIR, by filing an written application, was lodged by the informant himself on 25.2.2016 without giving any explanation regarding the said long delay in taking legal action in



respect of the alleged assault, the petitioner has been falsely implicated due to a land dispute relating to flowing of water in a drain, he has been languishing in jail since 21.04.2025, investigation against him has been completed and he bears no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP appearing for the State has opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is the sole assailant, who caused grievous injury to the vital part of the body, head of the informant, which gets corroboration from the injury report discussed in the trial court’s order.

6. Considering the seriousness of the allegation appearing against this petitioner from the FIR which is getting support from the informant’s injury report discussed in the trial court’s order, this court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, his prayer stands rejected.

7. The petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge if the same has not been framed.

(Shailendra Singh, J)

siddharthkr/BKS

-

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

