

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23506 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-340 Year-2025 Thana- RAJEPUR District- East Champaran

Sonelal Rai S/o Satyanarayan Rai Resident of village - Tajpur Saraiya, P.s.-
Rajepur, Dist.- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Abhishek Kumar, Advocate Mr. Sharad Kumar Verma Mr. Sagar Kumar, Advocate Mr. Hemant Ray, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Sanjay Kumar, APP Mr. Amit Bhushan, Advocate Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

2 08-04-2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Rajepur P.S. Case no.340 of 2025, registered under sections 329(3), 329(4), 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 110, 303(2), 352, 351(2), 351(3) and 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 to which section 109 of the B.N.S, 2023 was added subsequently.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that the six named accused persons including the petitioner herein came variously armed. The petitioner is said to have assaulted the informant on his head with a *farsa* leading to injuries.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case because of land dispute between the parties. No such occurrence as alleged in the FIR has taken place. Referring to the injury report (Annexure-2), it is submitted that the injury has been found to be simple in nature. The petitioner is in custody since 13.2.2026.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant. Learned counsel for the informant submits that the petitioner is named in the FIR and there is direct allegation against him of having assaulted with a *farsa* together with the corresponding incised wound on the vital part of the body caused by sharp cutting weapon has been found. The petitioner has antecedents as mentioned in paragraph no.3 of the petition.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegations in the FIR together with the corresponding injury having been found, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.

7. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail after six months.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Shiv/-

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

