

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30675 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-594 Year-2021 Thana- SAUR BAZAR District- Saharsa

1. Mannu Kumar @ Mannu Kumar Yadav S/o Chandra Kishor Yadav Resident of Village- Ajagaiva, P.S.- Saur Bazar, District- Saharsa
2. Ranvir Kumar Yadav @ Ranveer Kumar S/o Nandilal Yadav Resident of Village- Ajagaiva, P.S.- Saur Bazar, District- Saharsa
3. Munna Kumar S/o Madan Mistri @ Medan Mistri Resident of Village- Ajagaiva, P.S.- Saur Bazar, District- Saharsa
4. Nitish Kumar S/o Puran Yadav Resident of Village- Ajagaiva, P.S.- Saur Bazar, District- Saharsa

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satish Chandra, Adv.

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 28-07-2026 Heard the parties.

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for and is allowed to withdraw the anticipatory bail application of petitioner no. 2, Ranvir Kumar Yadav @ Ranveer Kumar.

3. The anticipatory bail application of petitioner no. 2 stands rejected.

4. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Saur Bazar P.S. Case No. 594 of 2021 for the offence registered under sections 341, 323, 307, 379, 385, 384,



427, 504, 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

5. As per the prosecution story, the informant alleged that the accused persons came to his clinic and after abuse, Nitish Kumar flashed a country made revolver and wanted extortion of Rs. 1,00,000/-. The petitioner no. 2 removed Rs. 13,700/- from the pocket of Sikendra Thakur and as he opposed, allegation is that, Ranvir gave knife blow which hit his eyes. Later, they retreated. He was shifted to Primary Health Centre and then to Saharsa Hospital. This followed the FIR.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that there is inordinate delay of one week in lodging of the FIR without giving any reason. Further, though main allegation is against Ranvir, omnibus allegation is against other accused persons. None have criminal antecedent.

7. Learned APP opposes the prayer submitting that they wanted extortion and in the process, injured the eyes of Sikendra Thakur.

8. Taking into account the submissions of the parties aforesaid, the main allegation is against Ranvir whose anticipatory bail application stands dismissed as withdrawn. Omnibus allegation of extortion is against others, they do not have criminal antecedent, in that background, this Court is



inclined to grant the petitioner no. 1 (Mannu Kumar), petitioner no. 3 (Munna Kumar) and petitioner no. 4 (Nitish Kumar) the anticipatory bail with conditions.

9. Let the petitioner no. 1 (Mannu Kumar), petitioner no. 3 (Munna Kumar) and petitioner no. 4 (Nitish Kumar) in the event of arrest or surrender within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the order, shall be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned C.J.M., Saharsa in connection with Saur Bazar P.S. Case No. 594 of 2021 subject to condition as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

(i) one of the bailor should be the family members/relatives of the petitioner no. 1 (Mannu Kumar), petitioner no. 3 (Munna Kumar) and petitioner no. 4 (Nitish Kumar), who shall provide official document (Aadhar Card, PAN Card, Driving License, Voter ID) to show his *bona fide*;

(ii) the petitioner no. 1 (Mannu Kumar), petitioner no. 3 (Munna Kumar) and petitioner no. 4 (Nitish Kumar) 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 Trial court itself;



(iii) the petitioner no. 1 (Mannu Kumar), petitioner no. 3 (Munna Kumar) and petitioner no. 4 (Nitish Kumar) shall appear before the concerned police station every month for next six months to mark attendance and at the end of the period, the certificate be submitted to the Court;

(iv) the petitioner no. 1 (Mannu Kumar), petitioner no. 3 (Munna Kumar) and petitioner no. 4 (Nitish Kumar) 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;

(v) the petitioner no. 1 (Mannu Kumar), petitioner no. 3 (Munna Kumar) and petitioner no. 4 (Nitish Kumar) shall desist from committing any criminal offence again failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds.

10. Office to submit a report as to why despite there being no typed copy of the FIR, it was not put in the defective category and rather sent 'For Admission'.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Vijay Singh/-

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

