

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5863 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-35 Year-2018 Thana- KAMTAUL District- Darbhanga

Kunal Bhardwaj @ Twinkal Son of Shankar Kumar Panday R/o Village -
Sirhulli, P.S. - Kamtaul, Dist. - Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kedar Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

6 29-04-2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner in this application prays for bail apprehending his arrest in connection with Kamtaul P.S. Case no.35 of 2018 registered for the offence punishable under sections 302, 307, 341, 342, 323 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that the accused persons including the petitioner herein were insisting upon the informant executing a registered deed transferring the land belonging to the informant in their favour. It is stated that the informant was not ready to do so. She has a son who is mentally unstable. On the date of occurrence, the accused persons abused and assaulted her as also brutally assaulted her husband with an iron rod leading to serious



injuries. Her husband died on way to the P.M.C.H.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has been falsely implicated in the case. The allegations are false and incorrect. No material has transpired in course of investigation to connect the petitioner with the alleged crime. It further transpires from the supplementary affidavit that FIR named co-accused Shankar Kumar Pandey has been acquitted by judgment dated 22.3.2021 passed in Sessions Trial no.481 of 2018 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge V, Darbhanga. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

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

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegation against the petitioner in the FIR together with the petitioner having remained at large for over 8 years before moving this Court for anticipatory bail, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Saurabh/-

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

