

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17841 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-371 Year-2025 Thana- MASHRAK District- Saran

=====

Ramnath Rai S/o- Jamuna Rai R/v- Dharmasati Gandaman Ps-Mashrakh Dist-Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ajit Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Mohammed Arif

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 13-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. Petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered
for the offence punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2),
117(2), 109, 352, 351(3), 3(5) of B.N.S., 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that on account of dispute relating to construction of
boundary wall by accused persons on the land of the informant,
Rishidev Kumar assaulted her son Lalan by rod causing fracture
of right hand, thereafter, Sanjay with sword and Rishi with rod
assaulted Santosh on head and body causing injury on head and
fracture finger, further Ramnath (petitioner) assaulted Manju by
lathi causing injury on head and Rina assaulted Munna by rod



causing injury.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the instant case by the informant, it is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R., it would manifest that on account of dispute, relating to construction of boundary wall, has been taken place, it is next submitted that petitioner is claiming the land as their while informant claimed that the land on which the boundary wall was being constructed belongs to the side of the informant, it is next submitted that even presuming what has been alleged is without admitting that injury suffered by Manju has been opined to be simple in nature as recorded in the order impugned, it is also submitted that the petitioner is not a criminal.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant oppose the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner but then are in a position to rebut the submission of learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that the injury has been opined to be simple in nature and the blow is alleged not to be repeated and the petitioner is not a criminal.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, let



the petitioner, as named above, in the event of his arrest or surrender within four weeks from today, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/-(Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate 7th, Saran at Chapra, in connection with Mashrakh P.S. Case No. 371 of 2025 (arising out of Complaint Case No. 1066 of 2025), subject to the conditions laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

sanjeev/-

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

