

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.90238 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-64 Year-2025 Thana- RUNISAIDPUR District- Sitamarhi

=====

Amarjeet Kumar, S/O Pankaj Kapri @ Pankaj Kumar Kapri, R/O village -
Shivhar @ Shivanagar@ Shivanagar, ward no.-5, P.S. - Runnisaidpur, Dist.-
Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Santosh Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Aslam Ansari, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

3 20-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. Petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Runnisaidpur P.S. Case No. 64 of 2025 registered for the
offences under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109(1), 308(5), 303(2),
352, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case is to the effect that the named
accused persons, including the petitioner and two to three
unknown persons armed with pistol entered the house of the
informant and it is alleged that the petitioner had assaulted the
father of the informant. It is further alleged that the petitioner



demanded ransom and even took away the mobile phone and gold ornament.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. It has further been submitted that even if the allegations are taken at face value, the injury sustained, as it appeared from the injury report, was approximately 1/2" x 1/2" skin deep. It has next been submitted that there were no repeated blows and therefore, there was no intention on behalf of the petitioner to cause damage and the altercation had taken place at the instigation of the informant. It has also been submitted that apart from the said, there is no specific allegation against the petitioner, rather, the other allegations are general and omnibus. It has lastly been submitted that for the same incident there is a case and counter case for the said occurrence and the petitioner had clean antecedent.

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

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties, 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 Runnisaidpur P.S. Case No. 64 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 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 observation, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

manoj/-

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

