

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20490 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-184 Year-2025 Thana- SAHIYARA District- Sitamarhi

Jay Ram Ray @ Jairam S/O Late Baudh Rai Resident of Village- Visnupur
Pitamber, Ward No.9, P.S.- Sahiyara, Dist- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nawal Kishore Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

3 19-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State through virtual mode.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Sahiyara P.S. Case No.184 of 2025, dated 14.09.2025, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 115(2), 117(2), 109(1), 126(2), 352, 351(2), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. The prosecution case is that, due to an earlier land dispute, the accused persons, including the petitioner, assaulted the informant with iron rods and *lathis* causing head and chest injuries, including rib fracture and also assaulted his wife when she came to rescue him, causing fracture in her leg.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the



present case on account of a longstanding land dispute. Referring to the impugned order, learned counsel submits that the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Sitamarhi, had categorically observed that there were direct injuries on the vital parts of the body and fractures of the left 6th and 7th ribs, which were grievous in nature, and considering the nature of the allegations as well as the injuries sustained, the privilege of anticipatory bail was denied to the petitioner. It is submitted that in the present case, the case diary along with the injury report was called for, and on perusal of the injury report issued by the Community Health Centre, Bathnaha, it appears that the report mentions tissue swelling on the parietal region and that the X-ray shows fractures of the left 6th and 7th ribs; however, the brain CECT report and X-ray films have not been annexed with the report. It is further submitted that the specific allegation has been levelled against co-accused Indal Rai, who has already been granted regular bail. Learned counsel further submits that both sides are agnates and the dispute has now been amicably resolved between them. It is also submitted that the petitioner, in order to bring an end to the dispute that had arisen between the parties, voluntarily undertakes to pay a sum of Rs. 5,000/- to the informant towards medical expenses and financial assistance for



the injuries allegedly sustained by him, without accepting his guilt, and further undertakes that he shall not repeat such conduct in future and shall maintain cordial relations with the informant's side, who are his brothers. Lastly, it is submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that the parties have resolved the dispute and the undertaking of the petitioner to pay Rs.5000/- to the informant towards his medical assistance, let the above named petitioner, be released on bail, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, 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 J.M. 1st Class, Sitamarhi/Successor Court in connection with Sahiyara P.S. Case No.184 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS as well as the following conditions:

(i) One of the bailors should be the family member/relative/known of the petitioner(s) who shall provide



official document/ personal affidavit to show his/her bona fide;

(ii) the petitioner(s) shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of his/her/their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds;

(iv) the petitioner(s) shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of their bail bonds.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

shikha/-

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

