

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.76199 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-310 Year-2025 Thana- DIGHWARA District- Saran

1. Jitendra Manjhi S/O Raghunath Manjhi R/o village - Kesarpur Ismaila , P.S- Dighwara , District - Saran
2. Raj Kumar Manjhi S/o Raghunath Manjhi R/o village - Kesarpur Ismaila , P.S- Dighwara , District - Saran
3. Dharmendra Manjhi S/o Raghunath Manjhi R/o village - Kesarpur Ismaila , P.S- Dighwara , District - Saran
4. Raghunath Manjhi S/o Late Hira Manjhi R/o village - Kesarpur Ismaila , P.S- Dighwara , District - Saran
5. Akalu Manjhi S/o Late Hira Manjhi R/o village - Kesarpur Ismaila , P.S- Dighwara , District - Saran
6. Parmeshwar Manjhi @ Parmeshwar Kumar S/o Akalu Manjhi R/o village - Kesarpur Ismaila , P.S- Dighwara , District - Saran
7. Pappu Manjhi @ Pappu Kumar S/O Akalu Manjhi R/o Village- Kesarpur Ismaila, P.S.- Dighwara, District- Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravi Prakash, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Anita Kumari, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 18-12-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, at the outset, seeks permission to withdraw the anticipatory bail application with respect to petitioner no. 5, namely, Akalu Manjhi who was arrested during pendency of the same.

3. Permission is accorded.

4. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is



dismissed as withdrawn with respect to petitioner no. 5.

5. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109, 352 and 3(5) of the BNS.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on 09.08.2025, at 05:00 p.m., the petitioners surrounded and assaulted him. Further, the reason for the occurrence was that Parmeshwar Manjhi (petitioner no. 6) and Jitendra Manjhi (petitioner no. 1) in a drunken condition were assaulting an elderly person, namely, Jay Kumar Hajara and when the informant tried to save him, accused Jitendra Manjhi assaulted him by knife thrice causing injury on his back. Further, Raghunath Manjhi (petitioner no. 4), Akalu Manjhi, Parmeshwar Manjhi and Pappu Manjhi (petitioner no. 7) assaulted Kamalnath Hajara, Raju Paswan and Rajendra Paswan who came to save the informant causing injury on the head.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that specific allegation of assaulting thrice by knife causing injury to the



informant is against Jitendra Manjhi. It is next submitted that rest of the petitioners are concerned, the allegation against them of assault is general and omnibus in nature. It is also submitted that no doubt, persons from the side of the informant suffered injury but then the injury suffered on account of assault made by rest of the petitioners excluding Jitendra Manjhi has been opined to be simple in nature.

8. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that from perusal of the allegation what transpires is that the accused persons were present at the place of occurrence and when the informant tried to intervene to pacify an issue in between Parmeshwar Manjhi and Jitendra Manjhi on one side and Jai Kumar Hajara on the other, the occurrence is alleged to have taken place. It is further submitted that Jitendra Manjhi is alleged to have assaulted the informant by knife thrice causing injury on his back and the injury has been opined to be grievous in nature. It is next submitted that no doubt, petitioners are not alleged to have assaulted by knife but then their presence at the place of occurrence emboldened Jitendra Manjhi to commit the occurrence of stabbing the informant causing grievous injury.

9. Considering the submissions made by the learned



A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners no. 1 to 4 and 6 to 7 in connection with Dighwara P.S. Case No. 310 of 2025 pending in the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Saran at Chapra/Successor Court.

10. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

