

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.84465 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-113 Year-2024 Thana- HASANPUR District- Samastipur

Vipin Kumar Son of Late Harinarayan Sah @ Harinarayan Sav Resident of
village - Mohiuddinpur, P.S.-Hasanpur, District- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Gaurav Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Madhav Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 19-01-2026 Heard Mr. Gaurav Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioner, Mr. Madhav Kumar, learned counsel for the

informant and Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey, learned Additional

Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail who is in custody since
14.08.2025 in connection with Hasanpur P.S. Case No. 113 of
2024, F.I.R. dated 20.09.2024 for the offences punishable under
Sections 126(2), 115(2), 352, 351(2), 109 and 3(5) of the BNS,
2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. According to prosecution case, this petitioner open
fired upon the informant which hit in his head causing injury to
him.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that due to admitted land dispute the present occurrence has taken place and both the parties are agnate to each other. Although there is specific allegation against the petitioner that he has fired upon the informant due to which he received injury but there is no intention to kill anyone and on the spur of moment, the present occurrence has taken place. He further submits that the present F.I.R has been instituted after delay of 38 days. He further submits that the police after investigation submitted the charge sheet against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 14.08.2025.

5. Learned counsel for the informant as well as Additional Public Prosecutor have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that there is direct and specific allegation of firing against the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances that the petitioner has clean antecedent, there is admitted land dispute between the parties and the F.I.R has been lodged after delay of 38 dyas, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of



the learned ACJM-II, Rosera at Samastipur in connection with Hasanpur P.S. Case No. 113 of 2024, subject to the following conditions:-

i. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

iii. And further condition that the 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.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Vanisha/-

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

