

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52570 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-161 Year-2025 Thana- TANKUPPA District- Gaya

1. SURENDRA MANJHI Son of Mantu Manjhi @ Maul Manjhi @ Rambilash Manjhi Resident of Village- Bardiha Tola Dukhi Bigha, P.S.- Tankuppa, District- Gaya Ji.
2. Ravindra Manjhi Son of Mantu Manjhi @ Maul Manjhi @ Rambilash Manjhi Resident of Village- Bardiha Tola Dukhi Bigha, P.S.- Tankuppa, District- Gaya Ji.
3. Sugiya Devi Wife of Ravindra Manjhi Resident of Village- Bardiha Tola Dukhi Bigha, P.S.- Tankuppa, District- Gaya Ji.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anmol Kumar, Advocate Mr. Sumit Kr. Singh, Advocate Ms. Abhilasha Kumari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Kumar Ranjit Ranjan, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 29-07-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending their arrest in connection with Tankuppa P.S. Case No. 161 of 2025, F.I.R dated 18.07.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 109, 140(1), 137(2), 302(2), 352, 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and under section 3/4 of the Dyne Witch Act.

3. According to prosecution case, the accused persons, along with unknown persons, allegedly trespassed into the



informant's house, assaulted her family members, and attempted to kill them. It is alleged that they threw the informant's father-in-law, from the roof, forcibly abducted him, looted household articles, snatched the informant's gold amulet, and threatened to kill the entire family. The informant's father-in-law has remained untraced since the occurrence.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that for the similar allegation as referred in the first information report, out of seven co-accused persons, three persons have already been taken under judicial custody and having been allowed the privilege of bail. It is the case of the petitioners that there is no specific allegation of assault against all these petitioners and the investigation has been completed, charge-sheet has also been filed. It has further been submitted that in case, they are sent up for trial, the petitioners would be ready to participate and cooperate in the trial. Lastly, it has been submitted that the petitioner is no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail application.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and taking into account that the allegations are general and omnibus and the investigation has already been completed.



Further, petitioners undertake to cooperate in the trial and having clean antecedent of all these petitioners, accordingly, this Court is inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Let the petitioners, above named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the Court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Gaya Ji in connection with aforementioned P.S. Case, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure / Section 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita and with other following conditions:-

(i) one of the bailors should be the family member/relative/known of the petitioner(s) who shall provide official document/personal affidavit to show his/her bona fide;

(ii) the petitioner(s) shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of his/her/their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall in no way try to induce or promise or



threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds;
(iv) the petitioner(s) shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of their bail bonds.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

rajan/-

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

