

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17384 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-430 Year-2025 Thana- RIGA District- Sitamarhi

Hanshlal Manjhi @ Hanslal Majhi, Son of Mahendra Manjhi @ Mahendra Majhi, R/o Village - Anhari Mushari Tola, P.S. - Riga, Distt. - Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Ritesh Kumar Narain Singh
For the State	:	Mr.Gauri Shankar Gupta, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Birendra Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

5 24-06-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. In the present case, the petitioner seeks bail in connection with Riga P.S. Case No. 430 of 2025, registered for the offence under Section 103(2) of BNS.

3. As per the prosecution case, the husband of the informant used to run a mobile repairing shop and allegation against the petitioner and other co-accused persons is that they used to beat him and give threat to the husband of the informant to act according to their wishes. Further allegation against the petitioner is that he called the husband of the informant on his mobile phone and, thereafter, the mobile phone of the husband of the informant became switched off. When the informant went



to inquire from the petitioner, he handed over key of the motorcycle of her husband though he showed his ignorance about his whereabouts. Subsequently, the dead body of the husband of the informant was found in an orchard and the informant named the petitioner and other co-accused persons for being involved in killing the husband of the informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. The prosecution story against the petitioner is not believable. If the petitioner would have killed the husband of the informant, it is not probable that he would hand over the key of the motorcycle of the deceased to his wife. Even the FIR has been lodged after much delay. It is alleged that the occurrence is stated to have taken place on 06.11.2025 at 6.00 AM and the dead body of the husband of the informant was recovered on 07.11.2025 at around 9.10 AM, but the FIR was instituted only on 09.11.2025 at 12.30 PM without any explanation. The learned counsel further submits that except for the allegation that the petitioner called the husband of the informant on his mobile phone, there is no other material to show the complicity of the petitioner in any manner in the killing of the husband of the informant. The learned counsel further submits that the post



mortem report shows testes of the husband of the informant was ruptured and he died due to haemorrhage and shock leading to CR failure due to ante-mortem injuries caused by hard blunt object. It shows the husband of the informant might have been killed due to some enmity with other persons as the deceased was a characterless person having enmity with many person. The learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 23.11.2025 and is having clean antecedents. The charge sheet has been submitted.

5. The learned APP as well as learned counsel for the informant vehemently oppose the submission made on behalf of the petitioner. The learned counsel for the informant submits that there is specific allegation against the petitioner that he called out the husband of the informant and when the informant went to inquire from him he handed over the key of the motorcycle of the husband of the petitioner.

6. Having regard to the fact and circumstances and submission made on behalf of the parties and considering the vague and remote nature of allegation against the petitioner and further considering the period of custody of the petitioner and his clean antecedent and also considering the submission of charge-sheet against him, the petitioner is directed to be released



on bail, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand Only) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-1, Sitamarhi/court concerned, in connection with Riga P.S. Case No. 430 of 2025, subject to the condition laid down under Section 480(3) of the BNSS and other following conditions:

(i) One of the bailors will be a close relative of the petitioner.

(ii) The petitioner will remain present on each and every date fixed by the court below, if so required by the learned trial court.

(iii) In case of absence on three 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.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

V.K.Pandey/-

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

