

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6413 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-314 Year-2025 Thana- KHAJANCHI HAT District- Purnia

1. Raju Uranw @ Raju Uraon S/O Munna Uranw R/o Village.- Rambag Drive, Tolayag, Shahar, P.s.- Sadar Purnea, Dist.- Purnea
2. Geeta Devi W/O Mahesh Uranw R/o Village.- Rambag Drive, Tolayag, Shahar, P.s.- Sadar Purnea, Dist.- Purnea
3. Birendra Uranw @ Dharmendra Uraon @ Birendra Uraon S/O Jagdeo Uranw R/o Village.- Rambag Drive, Tolayag, Shahar, P.s.- Sadar Purnea, Dist.- Purnea
4. Rukmani Devi W/O Subol Uraon R/o Village.- Rambag Drive, Tolayag, Shahar, P.s.- Sadar Purnea, Dist.- Purnea
5. Subol Uraon @ Suvol Uraown S/O Late Sukhlal Urawn R/o Village.- Rambag Drive, Tolayag, Shahar, P.s.- Sadar Purnea, Dist.- Purnea

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Mrityunjay Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Pramod Kumar Pandey
	Mr. Ram Pravesh Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 24-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with K.Hat P.S. Case No.314 of 2025, dated 30.07.2025 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 127(2), 329(3), 329(4), 303(2), 324(4), 308(2), 352, 351(2), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. As per the FIR, on account of a land dispute, the accused persons, along with 8–9 unknown individuals,



demanded Rs. 5,00,000/- as extortion money for allowing construction. They allegedly broke the fence and gate, committed theft, caused damage worth about Rs. 50,000/-, and threatened to kill the informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that both sides are agnates and that the petitioners have been in peaceful possession of the land for more than 50 years. Certain disputes are said to have been raised by the informant and his family members, with respect to which a title suit was decreed in favour of the grandfather of the petitioners. It is the case of the petitioners that, in order to oppose possession over the same, the present case has been registered by the informant, as the petitioners objected to their attempt to fence the land in question. According to the petitioners, the instant case has been instituted to create pressure upon them. Lastly, it is submitted that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents, except petitioner no. 5, who has one criminal antecedent.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioners.

6. Learned counsel for the informant has appeared



and does not dispute the factual position insofar as the issues settled in the title suit are concerned, but prays that the petitioners be directed to maintain peace and harmony with the informant and his family members.

7. In response, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners shall not disturb the informant or his family members and that a similar approach may be directed to be maintained by the informant. It is further submitted that the petitioners shall avail themselves of the remedies available under the law to secure possession of the land in question, in respect of which a decree has been passed in their favour.

8. Taking into account that the parties have agreed not to take the law into their own hands, let the above named petitioners, be released on bail, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Purnea/Successor Court in connection with K. Hat P.S. Case No.314 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS as well as the following conditions:



(i) The petitioners shall maintain peace and harmony and shall not involve themselves in any act that may disturb law and order or give rise to any further dispute between the parties.

(ii) One of the bailors should be the family member/relative/ known of the petitioner(s) who shall provide official document/ personal affidavit to show his/her bona fide;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of his/her/their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iv) the petitioner(s) shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds;

(v) the petitioner(s) shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of their bail bonds.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

shikha/-

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

