

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14449 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-314 Year-2025 Thana- MAHARAJGANJ District- Siwan

Kashinath Mishra Son of Late Dharmnath Mishra R/o Village - Takkitpur, P.S.
- Maharjganj, Dist. - Siwan(Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhijeet Gautam, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mohammed Arif, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 31-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2),
115(2), 318(4), 336(3), 61(2), 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS,
2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case, as would manifest from
the pleadings made in the supplementary affidavit and the
informant alleges that his co-villager, Ramdev on 03.06.2025
got a land registered from his cousin brother, the informant on
coming to know about the same reached the Registry office,
Maharajganj and requested his cousin brother (petitioner) not to
register the land, as the land was purchased by his father and



uncle in the year 1962 from Brij Nandan and Raghunandan Pathak, but informant was assaulted by petitioner and Ramdev and was also threatened, thus, he fled from the place of occurrence.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant, it is next submitted that informant and petitioner are cousin brothers and from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the informant alleges that petitioner sold the land of his father and uncle. It is further submitted that the land belongs to the petitioner also and if informant is aggrieved by the fact that the sale deed in favour of Ramdev has been executed by the petitioner with respect to a land which belongs to the informant, in that event the informant ought to have moved a Court of competent civil jurisdiction for getting the sale deed cancelled instead of instituting an FIR with a view to coerce the petitioner into submission. It is also submitted that had the informant moved before a Court of competent civil jurisdiction for getting the sale deed cancelled, the petitioner would have got an opportunity to rebut the claim of the informant.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the



anticipatory bail application of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Maharajganj P.S. Case No. 314 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

