

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.87335 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-212 Year-2025 Thana- MEHSI District- East Champaran

1. Bipin Singh @ Jitendra Singh Son of Ramayan singh Resident of Village - Cirecle Office Mehsi, P.S. - Mehsi, Dist. - East Champaran.
2. Rahul Singh @ Rahul Kumar @ Rahul Kumar Singh Son of Rajendra Chaudhary Resident of Village - Rampurwa Circle Office Mehsi, P.S. - Mehsi, Dist. - East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Abhishek Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Tarkeshwar Nath Thakur, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

2 15-01-2026 At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission of the Court to withdraw the present anticipatory bail application in respect of petitioner no. 1 as he has already been arrested.

2. Permission is accorded.

3. Accordingly, the present application stands dismissed as withdrawn in respect of petitioner no.1.

4. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner no. 2 and learned APP for the State.

5. The petitioner no. 2 apprehends his arrest in connection with Mehsi P.S. Case No. 212 of 2025 instituted for the offences under Sections 127(2), 127(7), 308(3), 308(4),



351(2), 111(2), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

6. Prosecution case, in short, is that while the informant's brother Arjun Prasad and nephew Abhishek Kumar, were returning from Mehsi Circle Office after discussing a land dispute, were allegedly abducted near Keshari Chowk by the named accused along with unknown persons on motorcycles and were confined at the house of Mukesh Pathak, assaulted, and later on, released with threats of death if they approached the police or visited the disputed land again.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner no.2 submitted that the petitioner no.2 has falsely been implicated in the present case due to previous land dispute between the parties which is evident from the FIR itself. Learned counsel for the petitioner no.2 submitted that general and omnibus allegation has been made against him. No specific overt act is alleged against the petitioner no.2. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner no.2 that the petitioner no.2 has one criminal antecedent.

8. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner no.2 and submitted that the petitioner no.2 is a named accused and the allegations disclose serious offences of abduction, assault and criminal intimidation arising out of a land dispute and the



manner of occurrence shows active involvement of the petitioner no.2 and therefore, the petitioner no.2 does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

9. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of offence, in my view, this is a fit case of regular bail, and hence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner no.2.

10. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner no.2 is, hereby, rejected.

11. However, if the petitioner no.2 surrenders before the learned court below within a period of six weeks from today and prays for regular bail, the same shall be disposed of on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

