

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23785 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-42 Year-2026 Thana- SONEPUR District- Saran

1. Ajay Kumar Singh @ Ajay Singh Son of Dev Kumar Singh Resident of Village - Sahpur, Police Station - Sonpur, District - Saran.
2. Mintu Singh Son of Late Braj Nandan Singh @ Vrijnandan Singh Resident of Village - Sahpur, Police Station - Sonpur, District - Saran.
3. Raj Gaurav Son of Mintu Singh Resident of Village - Sahpur, Police Station - Sonpur, District - Saran.
4. Dev Kumar Singh Son of Late Ramayan Singh Resident of Village - Sahpur, Police Station - Sonpur, District - Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 16-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Sonepur P.S. Case No. 42 of 2026, dated 14.01.2026 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109, 303(2), 352, 351(2), 3(5) of the B.N.S.

3. As per prosecution case, on 12.01.2026 at about 10:00 a.m., the accused persons, armed with swords, rods, and other deadly weapons, came to his house, whereupon Dev Kumar Singh ordered to kill him, and co-accused Raj Gaurav assaulted



his son Shivam on the neck with a sword with intent to kill. When the informant intervened, he was also assaulted, causing injuries to both. It is further alleged that the accused persons snatched his gold chain and threatened to kill them if any case is filed against them.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is next submitted that, for the same incident, there is a case and counter-case between the parties, in which both sides have sustained injuries. The injuries sustained by the informant and his son are found to be simple in nature. Counsel for the petitioners, in order to substantiate his submission regarding injuries sustained by the petitioners and their family members, has also appended prescriptions issued from the District Hospital with the instant anticipatory bail petition. It is further submitted that there are no specific allegations against petitioner nos. 1, 2, and 4 whereas with regard to petitioner no. 3, there is an allegation of overt act but, the injuries have been found to be simple in nature. It is also submitted that the allegations levelled against the petitioners are not corroborated by the nature of the injuries. Lastly, it is submitted that the petitioners are persons of clean antecedents.



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

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact fact that there is a case and counter case between the parties and the injuries sustained by the Informant and his son are found to be simple in nature and as also the fact that the petitioners bear no criminal antecedent, let the above named petitioners, be released on bail, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Saran at Chapra in connection with Sonepur P.S. Case No. 42 of 2026, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S. 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 their



bail bond by the district 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)

rishi/-

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

