

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11706 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-424 Year-2025 Thana- BIDUPUR District- Vaishali

-
1. Ranjit Rai, Son of Late Vishuni Rai Resident of Village - Naya tola Paharpur, Ps- Jurwanpur, Dist- Vaishali
 2. Indrajit @ Ranjit Rai, son of Late Baidnath Rai Resident of Village - Naya tola Paharpur, Ps- Jurwanpur, Dist- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 25-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. After some argument learned counsel for the petitioner No.2, namely, Indrajit @ Ranjit Rai, submits that he shall not be pressing the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner no.2.

3. The application against the petitioner no.2, namely Indrajit @ Ranjit Rai stands dismissed as not pressed.

4. So for as petitioner no.1, namely, Ranjit Rai is concerned, he apprehends his arrest in connection with Bidupur P.S. Case No. 424 of 2025 registered for the offences under Sections 109, 326(a), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,



2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959.

5. The prosecution case is to the effect that on the instructions of petitioner no.1, namely, Ranjit Rai, it is alleged that the petitioner No.2, namely, Indrajeet @ Ranjit Rai had fired upon the informant which hit on his thigh and apart from that the other accused persons have also assaulted him.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner no.1, namely, Ranjit Rai submits that the only allegation against the petitioner Ranji Rai that he had directed to fire upon the informant. It has further been submitted that the allegation is superficial in nature and no such incident as alleged had occurred and in fact the informant, who was the aggressor had approached the land of the petitioner and for which one Bidupur P.S. Case No.423 of 2025 was lodged on behalf of the petitioner's side. It has next been submitted that in the altercation that took place certain injuries were sustained by both the sides and the cause of the incident is said to be a land dispute between the parties. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioner No.1 has one criminal antecedent.

7. Learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and has stated that the petitioner is the order giver.



8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties, let the **petitioner no.1, namely, Ranjit Rai** 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) 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 Bidupur P.S. Case No. 424 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 petitioner shall be his close relative.
- (ii) The petitioner 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 petitioner will be liable to be cancelled by the Court concerned.
- (iv) If the petitioner is 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 petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, 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.

9. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail is allowed.

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

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

manoj/-

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

