

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39888 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-193 Year-2025 Thana- LAKHAURA District- East Champaran

Brajkishore Rai @ Brijkishore Rai Son of Late Babunand Ray Resident of
village - Gola Pakariya, Tola Fatepur P.S.- Lakhaura District- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ajay Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Anil Kumar Singh No. 1

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 29-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 126(2), 115(2), 76, 308(2), 318(4), 316(2), 351(2), 352
and 3(5) of the B.N.S.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has antecedent of three cases, but then all the
cases have been instituted on account of dispute relating to land.
It is further submitted that the informant alleges that her
husband Santosh had purchased the land in dispute measuring
02 kattha 01 dhoor by a registered sale deed dated 13.04.2015
and the mutation was done in his name and hence are in
possession of the land. Further, land mafia Rajeshwar, Anshu



and Suraj got the same land sold to Rajeshwar by a registered sale deed dated 12.01.2023 executed by Dinesh Thakur. Further based on the sale deed, the accused persons are demanding extortion of Rs.10 Lacs for leaving the land.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that petitioner is not named in the FIR. It is next submitted that informant alleges that her husband purchased the land in dispute from Mukul and the same land was sold to Rajeshwar by Dinesh. It is next submitted that Mukul is son of Dinesh as would manifest from the parentage of Mukul as recorded in the accused column. It is further submitted that name of the petitioner transpired during the course of investigation as he had also purchased some portion of the land from Dinesh. It is asserted and submitted that petitioner had not purchased the land which the informant is claiming to have been purchased by her husband. It is next submitted that if informant is aggrieved by execution of the sale deed by Dinesh in favour of the petitioner, in that event, the informant ought to have moved before a court of competent civil jurisdiction for getting the sale deed, but then, instead of resorting to the procedure envisaged under law, the instant FIR came to be instituted with



an intent to coerce the petitioner into submission.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, is directed to be released on bail on his furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) 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 Lakhaura P. S. Case No.193 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

