

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.77876 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-580 Year-2025 Thana- MAKHDUMPUR District- Jehanabad

Dhananjay Kumar S/o Judagi Sao R/o Village- Kharaka, P.S- Makhdumpur,
Dist- Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Alok Kumar Alok, Advocate Mr. Ajay Kumar Sinha, Advocate Mr. Vivek Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Shyameshwar Dayal, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 21-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. Petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Makhdumpur P.S. Case No. 580 of 2025 registered for the offences under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 115(2), 126(2), 117(2), 109, 352, 351(2) and 351(3) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant has stated that on account of dispute with regard to keeping of cow dung, the petitioner and other accused persons variously armed with the *lathi* and *danda* started abusing and assaulting, causing head injury. It is further alleged that when the son and daughter intervened to save their father, the co-accused, namely, Chandan Kumar assaulted the informant's son by means of rod, causing



head injury and even her daughter, namely, Anjali Kumari sustained injury.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case and the allegation against the petitioner is of assaulting the husband of the informant by means of rod, resulting in fracture of his right finger. He further submits that even if the said injury is taken into account, the same is found not on a vital part of the body and cannot be said to be fatal. It is further submitted that the petitioner is a Panchayat Teacher and only to settle personal scores, his name is given in present case, however, no such incident as alleged has occurred. It is lastly been submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid submission, facts and circumstances of the case, let the petitioner above named 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 Makhdumpur P.S. Case No. 580 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 his close relative.
- (ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present in the 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 antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the 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 prayer for anticipatory bail is 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			
---	--	--	--

