

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3730 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-32 Year-2011 Thana- PIPRIYA District- Lakhisarai

Manoj Sao @ Manoj Kumar S/o Rajendra Sao @ Rajendra Saw R/o village - Jhakhhar, P.S. and District - Lakhisarai, and presently residing at C-50, C-Block, Patel Garden, P.S.- Kakroula, District- South West Delhi, Delhi-110078.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Kedar Singh S/o Late Rameshwar Singh R/o village - Lal Diyara, P.S.- Pipariya, Distt.- Lakhisarai

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rana Randhir Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

2 28-01-2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner in this application prays for bail apprehending his arrest in connection with Pipariya P.S. Case no.32 of 2011 registered for the offence punishable under sections 420, 406 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that he was lured by Rajendra Sao of getting him work on the payment of Rs.50,000/. It is stated that after 3-4 days of the promise, Rajendra Sao along with his son ie the petitioner herein came to his house where the informant paid a sum of Rs.50,000/ to Rajendra Sao. However, neither the said Rajendra Sao got him the work nor did he return him the amount. On



going and demanding the amount, it is stated that the petitioner told the informant that he had not taken any amount and as such, the same would not be returned.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. The allegation is solely against Rajendra Sao ie the father of the petitioner and not the petitioner herein who is alleged only to have accompanied his father. It is further submitted that though the case is of the year 2011 as the petitioner has been residing and earning his livelihood in Delhi, therefore, the delay in moving for anticipatory bail. The father of the petitioner died on 9.3.2015. The petitioner undertakes to cooperate in the investigation/trial.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegation against the petitioner in the FIR, the allegation mainly being against the father of the petitioner together with the petitioner not having any criminal antecedent, it is directed that the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks, be released on anticipatory bail in



connection with Pipariya P.S. Case no.32 of 2011 on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Lakhisarai on the following conditions:

(i) The petitioner shall remain physically present in Court on each date of the case/trial and shall cooperate in the case/trial.

(ii) In case of the petitioner's absence on any single date for reasons not to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court, the learned trial Court may cancel the bail bond of the petitioner and take him into custody till conclusion of the trial.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Saurabh/-

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

