

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.37443 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-222 Year-2025 Thana- SURYAGARHA District- Lakhisarai

1. Sumit Kumar @ Sumit Yadav S/O Mahesh Yadav R/O Village- Chandanpura, P.S.- Suryagarha, Distt- Lakhisarai.
2. Anoj Kumar @ Anuj Yadav S/O Mahesh Yadav R/O Village- Chandanpura, P.S.- Suryagarha, Distt- Lakhisarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shantanu Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 18-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4) and 316(2) of the BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that he is posted with the CRPF, further Sumit, Anoj and others are running a brick kiln jointly in the village and had asked for loan, thus, an amount of Rs. 4,89,300/- was paid in the account of Sumit through *Phone Pe* and an amount of Rs. 1,50,000/- in cash on direction of the informant was given to



Mahesh and Anoj by Pramod, further they had assured that the money would be returned and if they are not able to return the amount then will execute sale deed with respect their land, but neither the money has been returned nor sale deed with respect to the land has been executed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that dispute is civil in nature to which a criminal colour has been given. It is further submitted that it appears that the instant criminal case has been instituted with an intent to coerce the petitioners and others into submission so that they under fear of arrest part with the fanciful demand of the informant. It is also submitted that even if what has been alleged in the FIR is a correct fact, in that event the informant ought to have approached a Court of competent civil jurisdiction for getting his grievance redressed, but then a criminal case has been instituted for ulterior reasons. It is also submitted that petitioner and others are running a brick kiln and informant had purchased a piece of land in the village, on which construction work was going on, for which the petitioners were supplying bricks, accordingly, payments were



made, but subsequently the present false case came to be instituted for reasons best known to the informant..

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioners.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or 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) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Suryagarha P.S. Case No. 222 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

