

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.73301 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-92 Year-2025 Thana- SIKTA District- West Champaran

Nitish Yadav @ Nitish Kumar @ Nitu @ Nitesh Yadav S/o Gorakh Yadav R/o
Village - Bardhai, P.S - Sikta, District - West Champaran at Bettiah

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Bimlesh Kumar Pandey
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Nand Kumar
	Mr.Ajeet Kumar Bhardwaj

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 13-11-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2),190,126(2),109(1),115(2),118,303(2),352,351(3) of the BNS.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on account of dispute relating to land petitioner assaulted him by farsa causing injury on head and snatched his chain while Raj Lal also assaulted him by an iron



rod while Mannu assaulted by lathi and Gorakh by sharp edged weapon, further Gyanti Devi and Sumit assaulted indiscriminately.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that on account of dispute relating to land, the occurrence is alleged to have taken place. It is submitted that since dispute relating to land was brewing in between the parties as such an altercation took place in which both sides assaulted each other. It is next submitted that from side of the petitioner, Sikta P. S. Case No.91 of 2025 has been instituted. It is also submitted that the injury suffered by the informant has been opined to be simple which amply amply demonstrates that petitioner never had any intention of committing a serious occurrence nor the blow was repeated.

5. Learned A.P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the anticipatory bail application, but then, are not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that the blow was not repeated and injury suffered by



the injured is opined to be simple in nature.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, 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 the learned Trial Court where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Sikta P. S. Case No.92 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

