

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60175 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-223 Year-2025 Thana- GHOSI District- Jehanabad

1. Sonu Kumar S/o Late Arun Prasad R/o Village- Akala Bigha, (Dayalpur), PS- Goshi, Dist- Jehanabad
2. Lalu Yadav S/o Gurkun Yadav R/o Village- Akala Bigha, (Dayalpur), PS- Goshi, Dist- Jehanabad
3. Binit Kumar @ Binit Raj S/o Mantu Prasad R/o Village- Akala Bigha, (Dayalpur), PS- Goshi, Dist- Jehanabad
4. Aditya Kumar S/o Mantu Prasad R/o Village- Akala Bigha, (Dayalpur), PS- Goshi, Dist- Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Bipin Kumar Deo
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Choubey Jawahar- A.P.P.
	Mr.Bhavesh Kumar Sah
	Mr.Rakesh Bihari Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 3 23-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission to withdraw the present anticipatory bail application with respect to petitioner no.2, namely, Lalu Yadav, who left for his heavenly abode during pendency of instant anticipatory bail application.
3. Permission is accorded.
4. Accordingly, instant petition is dismissed as



withdrawn with respect to petitioner no.2, namely, Lalu Yadav.

5. The rest petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 109, 352, 351(2), 303(2), 74 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner nos.1, 3 and 4 are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that her son (Nagendra) and daughter in-law (Mahima) were going to the bank to deposit Rs.2 Lacs which they had received after selling the land. Further, they were intercepted by Sonu and Guddu, who demanded the money on objection, both threatened by gun, thereafter Lalu and Manish tried to snatch the bag containing money from her daughter in-law. On protest, Sonu and Guddu fired causing firearm injury on head of her son, thereafter other named accused persons came and looted the money, chain and mangalsutra of her daughter in-law and Aditya and Sonu also assaulted them by rod causing injury.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant on account of dispute relating to land. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the



FIR, it would manifest that the petitioners were known to the informant and her son. It is also submitted that it does not appear probable that a person who was known to the victim would have committed such an occurrence of causing firearm injury to the son of the informant and at the same time would only have assaulted her daughter in-law leaving a witness against themselves. It is further submitted that though allegation is of firing, but the same is exaggerated and ornamental and from the injury report of the son and daughter in-law of the informant, it would manifest that the injury suffered by them has been opined to be simple caused by hard and blunt substance.

8. Learned A.P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the anticipatory bail application, but then, fairly submits after perusing the case diary that the injury suffered by Nagendra has been opined to be simple caused by hard and blunt substance and the injury of Mahima also has been opined to be caused by hard and blunt substance, but then, it is recorded that the injury may be simple, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that as far as allegation of firing is alleged, the same gets belied by the injury report and the injuries have been opined to be simple. The learned A.P.P. further submits that



if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioners may abscond on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that petitioners will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove their innocence.

9. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners, above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, are directed to be released on anticipatory bail on their furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each 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 Goshi P. S. Case No.223 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

10. The application stands allowed.

11. However, it is made clear that in the event, if any application is filed by the Investigating Officer before the learned trial Court bringing to its notice that petitioners, despite giving assurance to this Court, are not cooperating in the investigation or are not presenting themselves as and when required, the learned trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioners after recording reasons.



12.Let a copy of this order be sent to the concerned
Police Station through the learned trial Court.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

