

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.73087 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-60 Year-2024 Thana- Amdanda District- Bhagalpur

Ramdhir Singh @ Ramdhar Singh @ Randhir Singh @ Ramdhir S/O
Panchanand Singh R/O village - Rani Bamia, P.S.- Amdanda, Dist.-
Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Devendra Kumar Pandey, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

Mr. Surendra Prasad Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 3 27-02-2026 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 341, 323,
504, 506, 325, 307 and 308/34 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. The Station House Officer and the Investigating
Officer of the case, in compliance of the order dated 11.02.2026,
are present in the Court.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that on 07.06.2024, at about 10.30 P.M., when he was
having dinner, his uncle Panchanan Singh came and called him
and when the informant came out of his house, the FIR named
accused persons including the petitioner started abusing him. On



protest, accused persons assaulted the informant by lathi, danda causing injury on head and also suffered fracture of nasal bone, on alarm, villagers gathered and accused persons threatened to vacate the house or else the informant and his family will be killed and thereafter fled.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that on account of dispute relating to property, the occurrence is alleged to have been committed. It is further submitted that petitioner and the informant are own cousin. It is next submitted that allegation of assault is not specific and the date of occurrence is 07.06.2024 and the FIR came to be instituted on 13.06.2024 i.e. after a delay of more than six days which casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution. It is also submitted that had the injured been assaulted in the manner as alleged in the FIR in that event his fardbeyan would have been recorded at the hospital and if the informant was not in a position to get his fardbeyan recorded in that event any family members on his behalf could have instituted the FIR but then the FIR has been instituted based on written application of the informant on 13.06.2024. It is thus submitted that whether the occurrence as alleged ever took place or not is also not clear or



else the hospital would have informed the police that injured has been admitted in the hospital. It is further submitted that initially when the case was instituted, it was for the offences which carry punishment of seven years and less but on 07.10.2024 an application was given by the police for adding Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code in the FIR. It is next submitted that Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code came to be added in the FIR by an order dated 04.07.2025 but then an application seeking non-bailable warrant was filed much prior to that.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State though opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner but then is not in a position to rebut the submissions of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that FIR came to be instituted based on written application of the informant six days after the occurrence and initially when the FIR was instituted the same was with respect to offences which carry punishment of seven years and less and non-bailable warrant of arrest was sought by the police even before Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code was added and an application seeking non-bailable warrant of arrest was filed prior to Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code being added.

7. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the



petitioner at this stage submits that non-bailable warrant of arrest till date has not been issued by the Court and the said submission is not disputed by the learned A.P.P.. based on instruction. It is further submitted that petitioner is not a criminal.

8. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties let the petitioner above-named in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten 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 Amdanda P.S. Case No. 60 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of the BNSS.

9. The personal appearance of the Station House Officer and the Investigating Officer of the case is dispensed with.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

