

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.42735 of 2026**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-710 Year-2025 Thana- DANAPUR District- Patna

Arvind Kumar Singh S/o Ram Sanehi Singh R/o Mohalla- Ramjichak, School  
Road, PS- Digha, District-Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                                                                                                |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr. Sudhir Kumar Singh, Advocate<br>Mr. Ambrish Kumar, Advocate<br>Mr. Saharsh Singh, Advocate |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr. Shantanu Kumar, A.P.P.                                                                     |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

- 2      13-07-2026                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 329(3), 126(2), 115(2), 109, 351(2), 352 and 3(5) of the BNS.
3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that he purchased a piece of land from Ranjeet Kashyap and Saurabh Kumar and came in possession of the same, further on 07.07.2025 when informant visited the land he found the accused persons along with some unknown persons carrying out construction work, on protest by



informant and his brother, accused Arvind on order of Ram Sanehi assaulted him by an iron rod causing injury on head and thereafter repeated blow causing injury on back of the head and accused persons also assaulted his brother by bricks and rods.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant on account of dispute relating to land, it is next submitted that initially notice under Section 35(3) BNSS was given to the petitioner and the petitioner co-operated with the police in the investigation but later Section 109 of the BNS came to be added hence petitioner apprehends arrest, it is further submitted that even injury suffered by the petitioner is opined to be simple amply demonstrates that allegation of repeating blow stands falsified. It is also submitted that if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove his innocence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner but then are not in a position to rebut the submissions of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that the injury suffered by the injured is



opined to be simple in nature and initially notice under section 35(3) of BNSS was given to the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, let the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his 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) 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 Danapur P.S. Case No. 710 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

vikram/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

