

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.50194 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-170 Year-2026 Thana- RANIYATALAB District- Patna

Manikant Kumar @ Mintu Kumar S/o Sudama Mahto @ Sudama Singh R/o
Village - Kanpa, P.S - Ranitalab, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rahul Rathour, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rajendra Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GIRIJISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 22-07-2026 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner and learned A.P.P. appearing for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Rani Talab P.S. Case No. 170 of 2026 registered for the offence
punishable under Sections 61(2), 318(4), 316(5), 338, 336(3)
and 340(2) of the B.N.S.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner is alleged
to have fraudulently sold the thresher machine at the rate of Rs.
2,00,000 to the informant in order to grab the subsidy.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it
appears from the FIR itself that the enquiry has been conducted
on the application dated 11.05.2026 made by Rekha Devi stating
therein that she has given thresher machine to one Satyendra
Singh on rent, and neither he is paying her rent nor he is



returning the machine in question to her. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the informant has filed this case only to save his skin and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that cash memo, annexed as Annexure- P/2 series that Rekha Devi has purchased the thresher machine from the petitioner and she has also taken benefit of subsidy amount on the purchase of the thresher machine. He also submits that no incriminating article has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner nor he has played any role in the alleged offence. He has been languishing in judicial custody since 15.05.2026.

5. Learned APP appearing on behalf of the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that according to the FIR, the petitioner has misappropriated the subsidy amount of the Government. From perusal of the record, it appears that the conduct of the informant also appears to be somewhat dubious inasmuch as he claims to have purchased the thresher by making payment of Rs. 2,00,000/- in cash, however, no receipt, agreement, cash memo or any other document has been produced by the informant in order to prove the fact that he has purchased the thresher. Since the investigation conducted by the police is



based upon the application submitted by one Rekha Devi whom the petitioner has sold thresher machine, the case of the prosecution could not fail merely on the ground that the petitioner has sold the thresher in question to Rekha Devi. Learned APP further submits that there are three criminal antecedents against the petitioner but are not of similar nature to the allegation alleged in the present FIR.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and also the fact that the petitioner has sold the thresher machine to one Rekha Devi and a cash memo to that effect has also been brought on record as Annexure-P/2 series, as well as period of custody, let the above named petitioner be released on bail, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 20,000/- (Twenty thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the Court of learned J.M.F.C. Danapur, in connection with Rani Talab P.S. Case No.170 of 2026, subject to the following conditions:

(i) Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the Court and shall remain physically present as directed by the Court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.



(ii) If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witness, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(iii) And, further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedents, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. 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 verification.

(Girijish Kumar, J)

nitu/-

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

