

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32536 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-22 Year-2026 Thana- CHAUTHAM District- Khagaria

1. Satya Narayan Singh S/o Late Asarfi Singh R/o Village - Devka, Ward No. 5, P.S - Chautham, District - Khagaria
2. Jay Chandra Singh @ Ram Jatan Singh S/o Late Asarfi Singh Resident of village - Devka, Ward No.05, P.S. -Chautham, District - Khagaria
3. Jay Krishna Singh @ Bitthal Singh Son of Satya Narayan Singh R/o Village - Devka, Ward No. 5, P.S - Chautham, District - Khagaria
4. Deepak Kumar @ Dinesh Kumar Son of Ramratan Singh @ Ratan Singh R/o village - Devka, Ward No.05, P.S. -Chautham, District - Khagaria
5. Deewani Kumar @ Deewan Kumar Son of Jaychandra Singh @ Ramjatan Singh R/o village - Devka, Ward No.05, P.S. -Chautham, District - Khagaria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mukesh Kumar, Advocate
Mr. Ramesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Uday Pratap Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 24-06-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Chautham P.S. Case No. 22 of 2026, registered under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 118(1), 109, 324(4), 352, 3(5) B.N.S. { 341, 323, 325, 324, 307, 427, 504, 34 of the Indian Penal Code}.

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 at his *basa*, all the named accused



persons, including the petitioners herein came there and assaulted him and also damaged the *basa*. It has specifically been stated that petitioner no. 2, namely Jaichandra Singh @ Ramjatan Singh with an intention to kill the informant assaulted on the head of the informant with a spade, due to which he sustained injuries on his head and thereafter, all the accused persons started assaulting him with fists and slaps. It has further been alleged that when his cousin brother Vivek Kumar and Badal Kumar came there, co-accused Santosh Kumar and Deepak Kumar assaulted them with *lathi*.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have not committed any offence. He submits that there is an admitted land dispute in between the parties and the petitioners and the informant are agnate. The present occurrence is said to have taken place with regard to partition of ancestral properties in between the parties. He further submits that from the injury report, it would transpire that the opinion with regard to injury on the head of the informant was kept reserved for report of CT scan.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that co-accused Ramjatan Singh also lodged Chautham PS. Case No. 23 of 2026 for the same occurrence and a title suit



bearing title suit no. 16 of 2006 was filed in between the parties wherein the final decree bearing decree case no. 01 of 2017 has been passed in favour of the petitioners herein.

6. Per contra, the learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioners and submits that petitioner no. 2 assaulted on the head of the informant due to which he sustained injuries on his head and the injury report was kept pending for report of the CT scan.

7. Having considered the rival submission and after going through the records, it appears that the petitioners and the informant are agnates and there was a land dispute in between the parties for which title suit was also filed which has been decreed in favour of the petitioners herein. For the same occurrence case and counter case was lodged. Vide order dated 13.05.2026, case diary and injury report was called for however, from the injury report it would transpire that the opinion with regard to the injury of the injured informant has been kept reserved. Considering that specific allegation of assault on the head of the informant is there against the petitioner no. 2 namely Jaichandra Singh @ Ramjatan Singh, this Court is not persuaded to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner no. 2 Jaichandra Singh @ Ramjatan Singh, and



accordingly his prayer for bail is rejected.

8. So far the petitioners 1, 3, 4 and 5 are concerned, let the above named petitioners, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, be released on anticipatory bail in connection with Chautham P.S. Case no. 22 of 2026, on each of them 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/Successor Court, Khagaria subject to the condition laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal procedure/Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S, 2023, and subject to the following conditions:-

(1) 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 step for cancellation of bail bond 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 the verification.

(Ritesh Kumar, J)

Pallavi/-

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

