

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11466 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-619 Year-2024 Thana- FORBESGANJ District- Araria

Satyanarayan Mandal S/O Pujanand Mandal R/O Village- Bhattabari,
Maliyari, Ward No. 13, P.S- Forbesganj, Distt.- Araria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mrigendra Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bharat Lal, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 01-04-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Forbesganj P.S. Case No.619 of 2024, F.I.R dated 06.10.2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. According to prosecution case, on 06.10.2024 submitted by Anuj Nirala, Agricultural Coordinator-cum-Fertilizer Inspector, an FIR was lodged alleging that adulterated Potash fertilizer was being illegally manufactured in a godown situated near Kotihat river under Matiyari Panchayat, Forbesganj. Acting on secret information received at about 3:00 A.M., the officials conducted a raid and, after breaking open the



lock of the godown, allegedly found materials used for preparing adulterated fertilizer. In the presence of agriculture and police officials, they seized adulterated fertilizer, empty bags, a sewing machine, weighing scale (Taraju), red oxide, spade, and empty salt bags, and the seized fertilizer was sent for laboratory examination. A seizure list was also prepared. It is further alleged that at about 11:00 A.M. on the same day, a local resident, Goutam Kumar Choudhary, produced a rental agreement, which allegedly showed that the godown had been rented by the landowner, Sheela Devi, to the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, by referring to the contents of the F.I.R., submits that the agreement which forms the basis for implicating this petitioner, ought to have been produced by the land owners, namely, Sheela Devi and there was no occasion for such an agreement presented by Goutam Kumar Choudhary, who is purportedly said to be a witness of the said agreement, as per the allegation. It has next been submitted that the petitioner is in no way connected with the alleged incident while the petitioner is a labourer and for earning his livelihood, he renders his services in the locality and is completely aware about the incident in question. It has further been submitted that the petitioner has never met with the co-



accused Sheela Devi and for the purpose of providing a job, the signature which is said to have been obtained on a blank paper by Goutam Kumar Choudhary, seems to be have been misused at his instance which would be evident from the contents of the F.I.R. Lastly, it has been submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedent and is ready to abide by the terms and conditions in case the privilege of anticipatory bail is extended in their favour.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail application.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case and has nothing to do with the manufacturing of adulterated fertilizer and the petitioner has clean antecedent and has never met the co-accused Sheela Devi. Accordingly, this Court is inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his/her arrest or surrender before the Court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned S.D.J.M., Araria, in connection with



Forbesganj P.S. Case No.619 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure / Section 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita and with other following conditions:-

(i) 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;

(ii) 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;

(iii) 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;

(iv) 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)

sharun/-

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

