

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59487 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-281 Year-2025 Thana- MANER District- Patna

Manoj Kumar @ Manoj Ray S/o Late Rangila Rai @ Rangili Rai R/o Village-
Jivrakhan Tola, Goraiya Asthan, P.S.- Maner, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Subhash Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Sharda Kumari

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 06-01-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2),
115(2), 109, 303(2), 351(3) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya
Sanhita and Section 27 of Arms Act and Section 37 of Bihar
Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges
that on the date of occurrence at about 9:10 pm, when 7-8
accused persons including the petitioner came to his house and
started firing and when informant and his son came out, the
accused persons assaulted them with rod and bricks, further
when his wife and daughter intervened, they were also assaulted



and abused and their chain, mangalsutra along with ring were snatched, further the police was informed and accordingly the police came and arrested one accused in an intoxicated condition and from the place of occurrence, 3-4 empty cartridges were recovered and the occurrence took place on account of land dispute.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that petitioner had entered into an agreement for sale with the informant but then the informant after receiving money was not executing the sale deed on account of which a dispute had arisen. It is further submitted that on the date of occurrence, the petitioner was not even present at the place of occurrence and the informant took the occurrence as an opportunity to implicate the petitioner in the instant case. It is also submitted that though there is allegation of firing, but then allegation of firing is not specifically alleged against the petitioner. It is next submitted that though in the FIR, it is alleged that 3-4 empty cartridges were recovered, but then from perusal of the seizure list, it would manifest that only two empty cartridges were recovered from the place of occurrence. It is further submitted that the FIR itself discloses



that on account of dispute relating to land, the occurrence is alleged to have taken place and no one was injured in the firing. It is also submitted that petitioner will not abscond rather will co-operate in the investigation to prove his innocence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-five 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 Maner P.S. Case No. 281 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

7. However, it is made clear that in the event, if the Investigating Officer of the case files an application before the learned trial court bringing to its notice that the petitioner, despite giving assurance to this Court, is not cooperating in the investigation, in that event, the learned trial court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.



8. Let a copy of this order be sent to the concerned police station through the learned Trial Court.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

