

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12232 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-485 Year-2025 Thana- SAMASTIPUR MUFFASIL District-
Samastipur

-
-
1. Sonu Sahani S/o- Santosh Sahani Resident of village- Silaut PS- Samastipur Muffasil District- Samastipur
 2. Harendra Sahani S/o- Ashok Sahani Resident of village- Silaut PS- Samastipur Muffasil District- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Abhay Shanker Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Pawan Kumar Chaurasia, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Sudarshan Bhardwaj, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 05-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, the learned APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioners seek bail in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 118(2), 109(1), 352, 351(2) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Section 27 of Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and are in custody since 09.12.2025 and the informant alleges that he and his uncle



had given 10 katha land on *batai* to Sharvan for three years , further he asked Sharvan and his sons, Ashok and Sanjay to leave the land as they intended to do agriculture on their land, further the informant along with his family members on 07.12.2025 at 03:00 PM were on their land, when accused persons came and threatened to leave the land, on objection, Sharvan and Sanjay gave orders to Pankaj, Bhola, Sonu (petitioner no. 1) and others to kill, thereafter Bhola fired causing injury on stomach of informant, further Pankaj fired at Ajay causing injury on stomach and one villager Himanshu who was also present at the place of occurrence got shot below his waist.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that Bhola fired at informant causing injury on stomach, thereafter Pankaj fired at Ajay who also suffered injury on stomach and Himanshu also got shot, but then allegation of firing is not alleged against the petitioners. It is further submitted that on account of dispute relating to land, the occurrence is alleged to have taken place and the entire family members including the women member of



the family have been implicated. It is further submitted that Shravan Sahani, Bahuri Devi and Nirmala Devi had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Criminal Miscellaneous No.12660 of 2026 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 23.03.2026 with respect to Bahuri Devi and Nirmala Devi and Sharvan Sahani had withdrawn his anticipatory bail application.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State as well as learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the regular bail application of the petitioners. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that three persons suffered firearm injury. It is next submitted that petitioners may not be alleged to have fired, but then their presence at the place of occurrence emboldened the named accused persons who committed the occurrence of firing leading to injury. It is also submitted that charges against the petitioners have not been framed.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioners on bail.

7. However, the petitioners would be at liberty to renew their prayer for bail after framing of charge.



8. Accordingly, the instant regular bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

