

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67339 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-714 Year-2010 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - BARH District-
Patna

=====

Bipin @ Bipin Kumar S/o Rambalak Rai @ Ram Balak Rai R/o Village-
Manjhla Bigha, P.S.- Manjhla Bigha Muffasil, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Aryan Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Amitesh Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 24-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 302, 324, 201 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent. It is next
submitted that initially for the occurrence of murder of
complainant's son, Pandarak P. S. Case No.123 of 2009 was
instituted in which police submitted charge-sheet in the Year
2010 recording occurrence true, but no clue, thereafter a protest
-cum- complaint petition in the Year 2010 was filed based on
which cognizance was taken in the Year 2017, thus petitioner



apprehends arrest.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that initially an FIR was instituted with regard to killing of the son of the complainant for which a police case was instituted, but then, the police after completing the investigation submitted charge-sheet recording occurrence true, but no clue, thereafter the learned Trial Court based on a protest petition took cognizance in the Year 2017, but then, petitioner was never served with any summon that he was required to appear before the learned Trial Court. It is also submitted that when one investigating agency after threadbare investigation came to a considered conclusion that no clue could be gathered with regard to the occurrence whether it would be prudent for the Court to send the petitioner to jail based on an order of cognizance which came to be taken based on protest filed by the complainant. It is next submitted that a supplementary affidavit has been filed bringing on record the entire order sheet of Complaint Case No.714(C) of 2010 and from perusal of Page-11, it would manifest that the same records that non-bailable warrant of arrest has been issued against the petitioner on 21.05.2025. It is reiterated and submitted that petitioner was completely unaware that based on protest, cognizance has been taken against him. It is also submitted that



if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the trial to prove his innocence.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application.

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 Court below within a period of six weeks, is directed to be released on bail on his furnishing bail-bonds in the sum 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 Complaint Case No.714(C) of 2010, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S. with a further condition that one of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his uncle namely, Shailendra Ray, who has sworn affidavit in the instant anticipatory bail application.

7. The application stands allowed.

8. However, it is made clear that if the learned trial court comes to a conclusion that petitioner after his release is trying the delay the framing of charge or after framing of charge is trying to delay the trial in both the conditions, the learned trial



court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

