

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.87956 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-132 Year-2025 Thana- KISHANPUR District- Supaul

Ramchandra Mehta S/o Late Domi Mehta Resident of Village- Fulwariya,
Ward No 12, PS- Kishanpur, District- Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Satyam Anand, Adv

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Suresh Prasad Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 10-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 118(1), 109, 74, 303(2), 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges that accused persons including the petitioner came and started abusing and demanded extortion, on objection, the petitioner assaulted causing injury on head, thereafter Manish assaulted by farsa causing fracture of hand and also assaulted his wife by farsa causing injury on head, while Ashish and Shiv acted inappropriately with his wife and Anju snatched his wife's chain



while Ashish assaulted his mother by farsa on shoulder and thereafter the accused persons looted household articles.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant on account of dispute relating to land. It is next submitted that petitioner and the informant are agnates and are having dispute relating to land. It is further submitted that Balram Mehta had instituted Jamabandi Cancellation Case No. 211 of 2022 against Ramchandra Mehta (petitioner herein) in the court of Additional District Magistrate, Supaul and Jamabandi Cancellation Case No. 211 of 2022 came to be rejected by an order dated 28-3-2023, as such the case was decided in favour of the petitioner. It is also submitted that since land dispute is brewing in between the parties as such on the date of occurrence, an altercation took place in which both sides assaulted each other and from side of the petitioner Kishanpur P.S. Case No. 133 of 2025 came to be instituted against the informant and his side. It is further submitted that though it is alleged that petitioner assaulted the informant by rod causing injury on head, but then from perusal of the injury report, it would manifest that no injury was found on head of the informant rather two injuries on non-vital part of the body were



opined to be grievous and the injury near eye-brow was opined to be simple. It is thus submitted that on account of dispute relating to land, the occurrence took place.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner, but then is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that no injury on head of the informant was found and injuries which have been opined to be grievous are on non-vital part of the body.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Kishanpur P.S. Case No. 132 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

