

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.82338 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-221 Year-2025 Thana- SULTANGANJ District- Bhagalpur

Sandeep Bind @ Dhruv @ Dhruv Bind S/O Ramanand Bind R/O Village-  
Pildauri Bind Tola, P.S.- Sultanganj, District- Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar, Adv.

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

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      17-12-2025                      Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner and learned  
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Sultanjganj P.S. Case No.221 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 109, 351, 352 and 3/5 of the BNS.

3. The petitioner is said to have assaulted the informant by means of iron rod due to which he sustained head injury, besides the omnibus allegation of causing assault to the son of the informant along with other co-accused persons.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner contended that the genesis of the occurrence is nothing but a land dispute, which resulted into a scuffle and unfortunate injury. Prior to the institution of the present case, the wife of the petitioner had lodged Sultanganj P.S. Case No.220 of 2025 against the



informant and others. Moreover, even if the allegation is taken to be true, there is no repetition of blow and, as such, penal provisions prescribed under Section 109 of BNS is not attracted. The petitioner is a man of fair antecedent and he undertakes that he will fully cooperate in the proceeding of the Court.

5. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State submitted that on the assault being made by the petitioner, the informant has sustained a grievous injury and as such in any view of the matter, he does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Having considered the submissions advanced by the learned Advocate for the respective parties and taking note of the grievous nature of injury over the head of the informant, this Court is not acceded to the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. Accordingly, his prayer is rejected.

7. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the jurisdictional court within a period of four weeks from today and seeks regular bail, the same shall be considered and disposed off on its own merit(s) without being prejudiced by this order.

**(Harish Kumar, J)**

rohit/-

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

