

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.57823 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-187 Year-2024 Thana- ROSERA District- Samastipur

1. Ranjeet Thakur @ Ranjeet Kumar Thakur @ Raja S/o Vinay Thakur @ Vinay Kumar Thakur R/o Village - Harilochanpur Tisbara, P.S- Halai, District - Samastipur
2. Sanjeet Thakur @ Sanjit Kumar Thakur S/o Vinay Thakur @ Vinay Kumar Thakur R/o Village - Harilochanpur Tisbara, P.S- Halai, District - Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Madhav Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Nawal Kishore Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

4 21-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 108, 3(5) of the B.N.S.

3. The allegation in the First Information report is that the son of the informant had committed suicide on account of pressure being exercised upon him with regard to a case lodged by one of the accused persons of this case and also exercising pressure upon him for giving Rs.30 lakh and 10 *kattha* of land.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits at the outset that the present F.I.R. has been lodged after a delay of



five days inasmuch as, while the occurrence took place on 08.08.2024, the said incident was reported on 13.08.2024 and no explanation has been tendered for such inordinate delay. He has further submitted that the present occurrence is an act of desperation taken by the deceased on account of a failed love relationship with the wife of the petitioner no.1 and such relationship is admitted in the F.I.R. itself. Earlier a case has been lodged by the father-in-law of the petitioner no.1 for kidnapping his daughter against the deceased and others regarding which he used to remain under pressure. It has further been submitted that so far as these petitioners are concerned, the video footage prepared by the deceased before the suicide also does not indicate specifically that these petitioners were the ones demanding money and land etc., and in the F.I.R. also the allegation of demand has not been placed upon these petitioners rather the allegation against these petitioners relates to threatening and creating pressure.

5. The learned counsel for the APP has opposed the grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that all the accused persons including the present petitioners were indulging in harassing the deceased due to which he committed suicide.

6. After perusing the materials collected during the



course of investigation, it appears that although there is a video made by the deceased before committing suicide but the same relates to several reasons one of them being his failed love relationship and he has generally also mentioned about pressure upon him to alienate some portion of land and money, which has brought him in a disturbed state of mind.

7. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances and also considering the fact that the allegations may constitute words of harassment being caused upon the deceased but mere harassment cannot be equated with instigation to commit suicide, coupled with the fact that it was actually the deceased, who was having a relationship with the wife of the petitioner no.1 for which earlier also a case had been lodged not by the petitioners but by the father of the wife of the petitioner no.1 and also considering the fact that there is delay in lodging the F.I.R., let the above named petitioners, be released on bail, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Rosera P.S. Case No. 187 of 2024,



subject to the condition as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C/ Section 482 (2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, subject to further condition(s):

- (i) *One of the bailors will be their own blood relative, preferably, father, mother, brother, sister and/or his wife.*
- (ii) *The petitioners shall co-operate with the investigation, if not already concluded and make themselves available as and when so required, failing which the prosecution will be at liberty to move cancellation of their bail bond.*

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

anand/-

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

