

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.72969 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-256 Year-2025 Thana- DARIYAPUR District- Saran

Dinesh Manjhi S/o Late Gulab Manjhi R/o Village- Dariyapur, P.S.-
Dariyapur, Distt.- Saran at Chapra

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vijay Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Mohammad Sufyan, APP
For the Informant	:	Ms. Shweta, Advocate
		Mr. Vivek Raj, Advocate
		Mr. Pranjal Kumar, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 13-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Dariyapur P.S. Case No. 256 of 2025 instituted for the offence
under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109, 352 & 3(5) of the
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (B.N.S.), 2023. Subsequently, Section
103 of the BNS.

3. On 08.05.2025 at about 12:30 P.M., while returning
from a wedding procession, the informant's husband Jairam
Manjhi was allegedly assaulted by the accused persons, who
attacked him from behind, abused him, and inflicted serious
head injuries with a *kudal* and bricks with an intention to kill.



4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 15.05.2025. Petitioner bears no criminal antecedent/s, as per disclosure made in paragraph No. 3 of the bail application.

5. It has been further submitted by the petitioner's counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. From perusal of the FIR, it would reveal that petitioner and co-accused allegedly attacked with bricks on the head of the deceased. There is delay of five days in lodging the FIR. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Charge sheet has already been submitted in this case.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. It is submitted that there is specific allegation against the petitioner. Moreover, postmortem report also corroborates the allegation levelled against the petitioner.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and specifically taking into account the fact that there being direct allegation against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Prayer for grant of bail is hereby *rejected*.



8. The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as expeditiously as possible without any undue delay and unnecessary adjournments.

9. However, petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

