**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80186 of 2026**

**CNR No. BRHC011111052026**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-314 Year-2025 Thana- IMAMGANJ District- Gaya

==========

1. Nahid Khan @ Nahid Naiyar Rahmani @ Nahid Naiyar @ Nahid Nayar S/o Abdul Wafa Khan @ Abul Wafa Khan R/o Village - Kothi, P.S - Kothi, District - Gaya Ji
2. Manoj Singh S/o Badho Singh R/o Village - Jamuna, P.S - Imamganj, District - Gaya Ji

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

**Appearance :**
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arvind Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Sevak Choudhary, APP

==========

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

2 25-11-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. Petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Imamganj P.S. Case No. 314 of 2025 registered for the offences under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 115(2), 118(1), 109, 303(2), 352 and 351(2) of the B.N.S., 2023 and under Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The allegation against petitioner no. 1 is that he had assaulted the informant with sword causing serious injury on various parts of body, while the allegation against petitioner no. 2 is general and omnibus.

WEB COPY

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have falsely been implicated and no such occurrence as alleged had taken place. It has been submitted that on account of land dispute, the petitioners have been named along with other seven co-accused persons with general and omnibus allegations. It has been further submitted that the other accused persons have been granted anticipatory bail by co-ordinate Benches of this Court in Cr. Misc. No. 60142 of 2026 and Cr. Misc. No. 61755 of 2026. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioner no. 1 has one criminal antecedent while petitioner no. 2 has three criminal antecedents.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail has submitted that there is specific allegation on petitioner number one to have caused injuries by sword all over the body and therefore he should not be granted the liberty of anticipatory bail.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into account the allegation upon petitioner no. 1 of causing multiple injury on the body of the informant by sword, ***I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to petitioner no. 1.*** While the bail of petitioner no. 2 is being granted on account of the fact that the allegation against him is

WEB COPY

not specific. Let the petitioner no. 2 be released on anticipatory bail, in the event of arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/-(ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Imamganj P.S. Case No. 314 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure read with corresponding Section 482(2) of B.N.S.S. as well as subject to the following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be their close relative.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present in Court on each date of the trial.

(iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates, or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioner will be liable to be cancelled by the Court concerned.

(iv) If the petitioner is found involved in similar nature of offence in future, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move for cancellation of his bail bond.

(v) The learned Court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedents, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the

WEB COPY

petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

7. Accordingly, the present application stands allowed.

8. It is made clear that the observations, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

**(Sourendra Pandey, J)**

aditya/-

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **U** | | T | |

WEB COPY