

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.56077 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-40 Year-2025 Thana- Sonki District- Darbhanga

=====

Anil Sahu, S/o Baleswar Sahu Resident of Rasalpur, P.S.- Sonki, District-  
Darbhanga, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                            |   |                                          |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s       | : | Mr. Nilendu Kumar Chaudhary              |
|                            |   | Mr. Padmanabh Kashyap                    |
| For the Opposite Party/s : |   | Mr. Damodar Prasad Tiwary- A.P.P.        |
|                            |   | Mr. Uma Shankar Singh-Adv. For informant |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

- 4      12-12-2025                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and  
learned APP for the State.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the  
offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 308(3), 351(2) and  
3(5) of the B.N.S.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that  
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is  
languishing in judicial custody since 15.06.2025 and charge-  
sheet has been submitted. It is further submitted that allegation  
in the FIR is that Baidyanath Mukhiya committed cheating with  
the informant along with other accused persons including the  
petitioner with respect to an amount of Rs.81,51,000/- taken on  
pretext of selling land measuring 05 kattha 03 dhur, but then, the



sale deed was not executed.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R., it would manifest that the thrust of the allegation is against Baidyanath Mukhiya. It is further submitted that Baidyanath Mukhiya had approached this Court seeking regular bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.51736 of 2025 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 15.11.2025 passed by a learned Coordinate Bench. It is further submitted that as far as petitioner is concerned against him, it is alleged that he was a witness on the agreement and had received an amount of Rs.2.5 Lacs. It is thus submitted that the case of the petitioner is on a better footing than Baidyanath Mukhiya.

5. Learned A.P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the bail application, but then, are not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that case of the petitioner is on a better footing than accused Baidyanath Mukhiya. The learned A.P.P., at this stage, submits that if privilege of bail is granted to the petitioner the petitioner may abscond or try to delay the framing of charge and the trial, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of



the petitioner submits that petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the trial to prove his innocence.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, the petitioner, above-named, is directed to be released on bail on his furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Court below where the case is pending in connection with Sonki P. S. Case No.40 of 2025.

7. The application stands allowed.

8. However, it is made clear that if the learned trial court comes to a conclusion that petitioner after his release is trying the delay the framing of charge or after framing of charge is trying to delay the trial in both the condition, the learned trial court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

vikash/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

