

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9033 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-55 Year-2025 Thana- KHUTAUNA District- Madhubani

Manoj Sahni S/o- Ram Sevak Sahni Village- Kamalpur PS-Khutauna District-
Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravi Prakash, Adv.

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

Mr. Ramchandra Jha Raman, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 22-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Khutauna P.S. Case No.55 of 2025 registered for the offence under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109(1), 303(2), 352, 351(2), 3(5) of the BNS.

3. According to the prosecution, the informant, Rajdev Sahni, gave his statement (*fardbeyan*) on 25.04.2025 at approximately 12:45 PM. He stated that he is a fish seller and that on 21.04.2025, around 06:00 PM, while returning home on his motorcycle, he was intercepted and abused by several villagers named in the FIR. When he objected, Pramod assaulted him with a *lathi*, Manoj with an iron rod, and other co-accused with fists and slaps. After he fell, Paro Devi struck him with a



piece of brick, causing a bleeding injury to his left eye. The petitioner, Pramod Sahni, allegedly snatched ₹10,000 before the accused fled, threatening to kill him. Accordingly, the FIR was registered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent, has committed no offence, and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that no occurrence took place in the manner alleged; the entire prosecution version is a concoction and fabrication. Notably, while the alleged incident occurred on 21.04.2025, the *fardbeyan* was recorded only on 25.04.2025, and the F.I.R. was subsequently lodged on 29.04.2025. Learned counsel for the petitioner next submits that the allegations of assault are not corroborated by the medical injury report and the informant filed this false case due to a monetary dispute. Furthermore, Nathuniya Devi is the petitioner's mother, and a dispute exists because the informant forcibly entered into a second marriage with another person. Lastly, it is submitted that no case is made out against the petitioner under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109(1), 303(2), 352, 351(2), and 3(5) of the B.N.S.

5. The learned APP opposes the anticipatory bail application.



6. There is direct allegation against the petitioner of having assaulted with iron rod which has led to grievous injury.

7. Considering the seriousness of the allegation, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the application for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

Prakash Narayan

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

