

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.50045 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-153 Year-2025 Thana- Rangara District- Bhagalpur

Gaurav Kumar Son of Ambika Yadav R/O Village- Jahangirpur Baishi, P.S.-
Rangra, District- Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ranjan Kumar Jha, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nirmal Kumar Sinha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GIRIJISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 22-07-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Rangra
P.S. Case No. 153 of 2025, registered under Section 303(2),
352/351(2)(3), 109, 74, 115(2), 118(1), 3(5) of B.N.S.

3. As per the prosecution case, which has been lodged
on the basis of the written report submitted by the informant to
the effect that on 05.07.2025 at about 4:00 PM, a dispute arose
when the informant caught the accused allegedly stealing his
bamboo. During the altercation, the accused persons assaulted
the informant and his family with lathis and sticks. It is alleged
that accused Gaurav Kumar struck the informant's son on the
neck with a dabiya, causing a bleeding injury, while the
informant's daughters also sustained cut injuries. The accused



allegedly took ₹ 10,000 and threatened the informant and his family with dire consequences if they initiated legal proceedings.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is quite innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case only due to some previous dispute, ulterior motive, dirty village politics, malice and grudge. The falsity of the prosecution case would be evident from the fact that the alleged occurrence has happened on 05.07.2025 and F.I.R. has been lodged on 08.07.2025 and for the said delay of 3 days, no explanation has been given. The allegation against the petitioner are of general and omnibus. He further submits that the injury report does not supports the factum of prosecution case and the doctor has opinion that the injuries of all injured persons are simple in nature. Petitioner is in custody since 21.04.2026. He further submitted that petitioner impleaded in this case due to land dispute and petitioner is a nephew of the informant. Therefore, the petitioner deserves the privilege of regular bail.

5. Learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submitted that the petitioner has one criminal antecedent which is serious in nature and petitioner attacked the victims with an ulterior motive.



Therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of regular bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and also submission of learned counsel for the petitioner, it is clear that there is land dispute between the petitioner and the informant, and also FIR has been lodged after three days from the date of incidence, and further injury report does not support the factum of prosecution and Doctor opined that the injuries of all the injured persons are simple in nature. Petitioner is in custody since 21.04.2026, therefore let the above named petitioner be released on bail, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 20,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned A.C.J.M 1st, Naugachia in connection with Rangra P.S. Case No. 153 of 2025, subject to the following conditions :-

(1) 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.

(2) 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.

(3) 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)

amit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

