

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30774 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-27 Year-2026 Thana- SIKANDRA District- Jamui

=====

Jitun Saw Son of Ram Ratan Saw Resident of Village- Dhadhaur, Ps-
Sikandra, Dist- Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Pramod Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Jagdhar Prasad, APP
	:	Mr. Samit Kumar Bharti, Advocate
	:	Mr. Ram Parwesh Kumar, Advocate
	:	Mr. Satendra Prasad Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 15-07-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the

learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant and the

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in
connection with Sikandra P.S. Case No. 27 of 2026, for
allegedly having committed offence under Sections 126(2),
115(2), 109(1), 351(2), 352 and 3(5) of the BNS.

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 while he was returning from his field
along with his nephew Rahul Kumar, all the accused persons
and one unknown person starting assaulting them. All the



accused persons assaulted the informant with stick and iron rod, due to which he sustained injuries and fell down on the ground. It has further been alleged that co-accused Ram Ratan Saw and the petitioner assaulted on the head of the nephew of the informant with an iron rod, due to which he sustained injuries and when the villagers reached there, all the accused persons fled from the place of the occurrence.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no such occurrence has taken place and the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that the occurrence, if any, has taken place due to dispute in between the parties with regard to drain and general and omnibus allegations of assault are there against all the accused persons. He further submits that so far petitioner is concerned, specific allegation of assault on the head of the nephew of the informant with an iron rod is there, however the injury was found to be simple in nature by the treating doctor. He further submits that the petitioner bears a clean antecedent.

5. Per contra, the learned counsel for the informant opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that all the accused persons, including the petitioner assaulted the informant, due to which he sustained injuries and one of the



injuries have been found to be grievous in nature by the treating doctor. He further submits that specific allegation of assaulting on the head of the nephew of the informant is against this petitioner.

6. The learned APP for the State also opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the doctor found one of the injuries to be grievous in nature, which has been caused on the body of the informant. The Specific allegation of assault on the head of the nephew of the informant is there against the petitioner.

7. Having heard the rival submissions and after going through the records, it appears that general and omnibus allegation of assault on the body of the informant is there against the petitioner and other co-accused persons. Further, specific allegation of assault on the head of the nephew of the informant with an iron rod is there against the petitioner. From perusal of the case diary, it would transpire that the doctor has found the injury caused on the body of nephew of the informant to be simple in nature. So far the informant is concerned, one of his injuries i.e. fracture of 8th Rib on the right side of Thorax Reason has been found to be grievous in nature. Specific allegation of assault on the head is there against the petitioner,



however the same has been found to be simple in nature by the doctor and so far the injury on the Thorax reason, which has been found to be grievous in nature is concerned, the same is not on the vital part of the body. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jamui in connection with Sikandra P.S. Case No. 27 of 2026, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S., with further condition:

(1) The learned Court concerned shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedents, the court concerned shall take steps for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. 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)

AjayMishra/-

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

