

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11776 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-311 Year-2025 Thana- PANAPUR District- Saran

-
1. Ramagya Ray Son of Late Paltu Ray Resident of Village- Bijauli (Bijili), 37, Ps- Panapur, Dist- Saran
 2. Raushan Ray Son of Umesh Ray Resident of Village- Bijauli (Bijili), 37, Ps- Panapur, Dist- Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ram Sandesh Roy, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Pushpa Sinha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 26-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. Petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Panapur P.S. Case No. 311 of 2025 registered for the offences under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109(1), 324(2), 351(2), 352 and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. As per the prosecution case, it has been alleged that 14 members of the petitioner's side, variously armed started assaulting the informant and others. It has been specifically mentioned about three persons to have assaulted the informant and his nephew.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the



petitioners have falsely been implicated in a general and omnibus allegation of assault. He further submits that there is no specific allegation levelled against the petitioners, rather the allegations of a specific assault has been made against three accused persons, namely Saroj Rai, Ritik Rai, and Umesh Rai. It has further been submitted that for the same incident, a counter case was lodged on behalf of the petitioners being Panapur P.S. Case No. 315 of 2025 and in fact, one Lalbabu Rai had received grievous injury in the said altercation. It has next been submitted that on account of land dispute, an altercation had taken place and the petitioners in defense had fought with the aggressors. It has lastly been submitted that there is no injury reference to the injuries sustained by the persons, however, the specific allegations are against others and the petitioners carry clean antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid submission, facts and circumstances of the case, let the petitioners above named be released on anticipatory bail, in the event of arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/-(ten



thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Panapur P.S. Case No. 311 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure read with corresponding Section 482(2) of B.N.S.S. as well as subject to the following conditions:-

- (i) One of the bailors of the petitioners shall be their close relative.
- (ii) The petitioners shall remain physically present in Court on each date of the trial.
- (iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates, or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioners will be liable to be cancelled by the Court concerned.
- (iv) If the petitioners are found involved in similar nature of offence in future, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move for cancellation of his bail bond.
- (v) The learned Court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioners have concealed their criminal antecedents, the court



below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

7. Accordingly, the present application stands allowed.

8. It is made clear that the observations, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

aditya/-

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

