

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.70849 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-395 Year-2024 Thana- BIBHUTIPUR District- Samastipur

Manjaylal Kumar @ Manjay Lal S/o Sitaram Singh R/o Village- Belsandi
Tara, P.S.- Bibhutipur, District- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mirityunjay Kumar, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 09-10-2025 Heard Mr. Mrityunjay Kumar, learned counsel for
the petitioner and Mr. Jagdhar Prasad, learned APP for the
State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection
with Bibhutipur P.S. Case No. 395 of 2024 registered for the
offence punishable under Sections 326(g), 126(2), 115(2), 352
and 351(2) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. The case of the prosecution is that on 07.11.2024,
when the informant was sitting at his door, it is alleged that at
that time, the petitioner, along with others, arrived there and
started abusing him. Ranju Devi brought the kerosene oil from
the tempo. Manjay Lal (petitioner) took the kerosene oil from
the hand of Ranju Devi and sprinkled it at the house of the
informant, and it is alleged that Mukesh Kumar put fire to the



house of the informant, due to which his residential house and other articles got burnt.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He also submits that from perusal of the FIR, it is evident that the date of occurrence is 07.11.2024, whereas the FIR was lodged on 15.11.2024. It has also been submitted that there is litigation between the parties, and the present case was filed against the brother of the informant, who has kidnapped Ranju Devi, one of the accused in this case, and it has been alleged that he has committed rape. He further submits that it is a counter-blast to that case. It is also submitted that the delay in filing the FIR has not been explained, and manner in which the FIR has been drafted, implicating every member, clearly shows that it is an afterthought. He further submits that a statement has been made in para 3 of the petition that petitioner has no criminal antecedent and he is languishing in judicial custody since 29.06.2025.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and



considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The above named petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. ten thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Rosera/Successor Court Samastipur in connection with Bibhutipur P.S. Case No. 395 of 2024.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

