

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25726 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-232 Year-2025 Thana- ATHMALGOLA District- Patna

1. Ram Naresh Singh son of Late Bhuneshwar Singh R/o village- sabnima, PS -Athmalgola, District- Patna
2. Ranjeet Kumar son of Kameshwar Singh R/o village- sabnima, PS -Athmalgola, District- Patna
3. Mahesh Kumar Singh @ Mahesh Kumar @ Mahesh Singh son of Late Bhuneshwar Singh R/o village- sabnima, PS -Athmalgola, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kumar Rajeev, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Kumar Veerendra Narayan, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 22-04-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned A.P.P. appearing for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Athmalgola P.S. Case No.232 of 2025, for allegedly having committed offences under Sections 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 61 of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. As per the prosecution story, which has been lodged on the basis of the written report submitted by the informant, to the effect that 58 decimals of land was purchased by his ancestors in the year 1910 and he is in peaceful possession of the same. It has been alleged that the petitioner no.1, who is co-



villager of the informant, sold the said land to his cousin, Ranjeet Kumar (petitioner no.2) on 14.02.2017, in which the petitioner no.3 is a witness.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the prosecution story is false and concocted. The true fact is that the land belongs to the petitioner no.1 and the same was purchased by his ancestors on 18.08.1966 from one Dharo Mahto through registered sale deed and since then the petitioner no.1 is coming in peaceful possession of the same. The rent receipt was being issued in the name of the father of the petitioner no.1 and therefore, he sold the said land to his cousin, Ranjeet Kumar through a registered sale deed dated 14.02.2017. After purchase of the land, the petitioner no.2 is coming in peaceful possession of the said land and the same has been mutated in his name. It is submitted that the informant has filed the present case in 2025, i.e., after eight years of the execution of the sale deed. He further submits that the petitioner no.1 has got seven criminal antecedents and in some of the cases, he has been acquitted and in other cases he is on bail, except Athmalgola P.S. Case No.281 of 2025 in which investigation is going on. Similarly, the petitioner no.2 has got seven criminal antecedents and in two cases, he has been acquitted while in



other cases, he is on bail. Further, the petitioner no.3 has got nine criminal antecedents, out of which, in two cases, he has been acquitted, and is on bail in five cases and in two cases, final form has been submitted

5. The learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioners and submits that the petitioners are habitual offenders and have been made accused in similar nature of cases of land grabbing.

6. Having considered the rival submissions and after going through the records, it appears that the informant has filed the present case after eight years of execution of the sale deed and has tried to put pressure upon the petitioners by filing the present case in order to settle the civil dispute.

7. Taking into consideration the facts aforesaid, let the petitioners, above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks, be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned A.C.J.M., Barh, Patna in connection with Athmalgola P.S. Case No.232 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S. with a further condition that:-



The learned court concerned shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioners have concealed their criminal antecedent, the court concerned shall take steps for cancellation of bail bonds of the petitioners. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Ritesh Kumar, J.)

Sanjay/-

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

