IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78456 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC011118952026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-106 Year-2026 Thana- Piplawa District- Patna

==========

1. Sohan Manjhi @ Sohan Kumar S/o Suryadev Manjhi R/o Village - Bara, Mushari Tola, PS - Piplawan, Distt - Patna
2. Laxman Manjhi @ Lakshman Kumar @ Kallu Manjhi S/o Late Jamun Manjhi @ Jawan Manjhi R/o Village - Bara, Mushari Tola, PS - Piplawan, Distt - Patna

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioners : Mr. Dineshwar Pandey, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Nirmal Kumar Sinha, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

2 05-11-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Piplawan P.S. Case No.106 of 2026 for allegedly having committed offences under Sections 115(1), 117(1), 126(2), 74, 303(2), 352, 351(2)(3), 109(1) and 3(5) of B.N.S.

3. As per the prosecution story, which has been lodged on the basis of the written report submitted by the informant, to the effect that on 11.06.2026 at around 21:30 hours, some people of the village started using filthy language and assaulting his son. When the informant came to know about the said

WEB COPY

occurrence on 13.06.2026, with a view to pacify the matter, he called Ramakant Manjhi on phone and told him to come for compromise. On the same day at around 09:00 hours in the morning, all the named accused persons, including the petitioners herein came armed with weapons and started using filthy language. They also assaulted the informant and when the wife and sister-in-law (younger brother's wife) of the informant came out, then they committed indecent act against them. When the informant objected to their behaviour, then co-accused, Suryadeo Manjhi ordered to kill him, upon which the petitioners herein, who were armed with iron rod, assaulted the informant. Due to assault made by the petitioner no.2, the informant sustained injuries on his left leg and the same got fractured. On account of the assault made by the petitioner no.1, which hit him on his head, he sustained head injuries and fell down on the ground.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have not committed any offence. He submits that although the occurrence is said to have taken place on 13.06.2026, however the first information report was lodged on 22.06.2026 and the delay has not been satisfactorily explained, since the statement of the informant

WEB COPY

was recorded at PMCH on 15.06.2026. He next submits that so far the injuries sustained by the informant is concerned, the same has been found to be simple in nature by the treating doctor. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the allegations levelled in the first information report are false and concocted and there is no iota of truth in the same. He submits that the petitioners have got a clean antecedent.

5. *Per contra*, the learned APP appearing on behalf of the State, while opposing the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, submits that there is direct allegation of assault against both the petitioners herein, therefore they do not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Having considered the rival submissions and after going through the records, it appears that there was an assault on the son of the informant two days back, for which the informant called one of the accused persons to come for compromise, upon which all the named accused persons, including the petitioners herein came there armed with weapons and on the orders given by co-accused Suryadeo Manjhi, the petitioner no.1 assaulted on the head of the informant with an iron rod and the petitioner no.2 assaulted on his left leg with an iron rod, due to which the same got fractured. From perusal of the impugned

WEB COPY

order dated 11.09.2026 passed by the learned District & Additional Sessions Judge-VI, Danapur as well as Annexure-P/2 to the present anticipatory bail petition, it would transpire that the learned Judge after going through paragraph no.44 of the case diary, wherein the injury report was recorded, recorded that the injury sustained by the informant has been found to be simple in nature by the treating doctor.

7. Taking into consideration the facts aforesaid as well as after going through Annexure-P/2 to the present anticipatory bail petition, which is the injury report of the informant, let the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks, be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned A.C.J.M.-IV, Danapur, Patna in connection with Piplawan P.S. Case No.106 of 2026 subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S. with a further condition that:-

(i) The learned court concerned shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioners have concealed their criminal antecedent, the court concerned shall take steps for cancellation of their bail bonds. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in

WEB COPY

terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Ritesh Kumar, J.)

Sanjay/-

U		T	

WEB COPY