

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 32320 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-19 Year-2026 Thana- CHANDI District- Bhojpur

-
1. Aditya Kumar @ Aditya Singh S/O Syamjeet Yadav R/O Vill.- Bhairo Tola,
P.S.- Chandi, Dist.- Bhojpur
 2. Chandralok Kumar @ Chandralok Singh S/O Syamjeet Yadav R/O Vill.-
Bhairo Tola, P.S.- Chandi, Dist.- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Shiv Prasad Gupta, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Prabhat Kumar Singh, Advocate
	Ms. Priya, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

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

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Chandi Police Station Case No. 19 of 2026 District Bhojpur registered Under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109, 117(2), 125(a), 352, 351(1), 3(5) of BNS 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 he was in a friendly-term with Shyamjeet Yadav and on his request, Rs. 30,000/- was handed over to him to plant potato crop, which he promised to return by 15.01.2026. When the same was not returned, the informant asked for refund of his



money, upon which the said Shyamjeet Yadav started using filthy language and ordered his son namely Chandralok Singh and Aditya Singh (petitioners herein) to kill the informant. It is alleged that the petitioner no. 2 assaulted the informant on his left hand with a *farsa* while petitioner no. 1 assaulted the informant with a *lathi* on his left hand. It has been further alleged that the petitioner no. 2 then assaulted on the back side of the head of the son of the informant while the petitioner no. 1 assaulted on the left hand of the son of the informant.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the petitioners are innocent and have not committed any offence. He submits that the story of the informant with regard to taking loan to the tune of Rs. 30,000/- by the father of the petitioners is entirely false. He further submits that both the parties are next-door neighbours and *gotia* and there is a dispute with regard to the flowing of drain and on account of the same the said occurrence has taken place. He submits that the doctor who has treated the injured Krishna Singh (the informant herein), found the injury no. 1 and 2 to be simple in nature, however the opinion with regard to the injury no. 3 was kept reserved. He submits that the injury no. 3 has been mentioned that the informant is unable to lift his left shoulder. Similarly,



the injury no. 1 and 3 sustained by the son of the informant have been found to be simple in nature, however with regard to injury no. 2 the same has been kept reserved. He submits that the injury no. 2 has been found by the doctor to be that the injured is unable to fold both shoulders. He submits that the petitioners have got a clean antecedent.

5. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioners and submits that both the persons brutally assaulted the informant and his family members, due to which they sustained multiple injuries and the doctor who had treated the informant and his son found two injuries to be simple in nature, however with regard to one injury opinion has been kept reserved, therefore the petitioners do not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Similarly, the learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioners and submits that the petitioners have brutally assaulted the informant and his son, due to which they suffered multiple injuries.

7. Having considered the rival submissions and after going through the records it appears that the informant and his son were assaulted by both the petitioners, however from the



injury report which has been annexed along with the present bail petition, it would transpire that so far the informant is concerned the doctor, who had treated him found two of the injuries to be simple in nature and with regard to the injury no. 3 it has been recorded that “unable to lift shoulder”, the opinion has been kept reserved. So far the injury report of the son of the informant is concerned the doctor who had treated him found two of the injuries to be simple in nature and with regard to one injury i.e., unable to fold both shoulder, he had kept his opinion reserved.

8. Considering that the injuries are simple in nature and the injuries on both the injured persons, with regard to which the opinion has been kept reserved, is not on the vital part of the body. Considering the above, let the above named petitioners, in the event of arrest/surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned JMFC Bhojpur at Ara in connection with Chandi Police Station Case No. 19 of 2026, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, and subject to the following condition:-



(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 antecedents, the court concerned shall take steps 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	
---	--	---	--

