

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3616 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-250 Year-2024 Thana- DIDARGANJ District- Patna

Sanju Manoj Ray @ Sanju Ray W/O Manoj Kumar Ray R/O Village -
Rampur Shyam Chak, P.O- Rampur Shyam Chak, P.S- Raghapur, Distt.-
Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ramesh Kumar Choudhary, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Madan Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 28-01-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Didarganj P.S. Case No.250 of 2024, F.I.R dated 14.07.2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 303(2), 308(2), 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. According to prosecution case, 04.07.2024 at about 11:30 a.m., the informant, Vidya Nand Ray, reached the disputed land at village Mohli and found Sheo Balak Singh and Kundan Kumar carrying out pillaring work. When the informant objected, Kundan Kumar allegedly snatched Rs.10,000 and demanded Rs.10 lakh as extortion (rangdari) for vacating the



land. It is further alleged that there was an agreement for sale of the land between the petitioner and the informant, which led to an altercation among them. Subsequently, on 09.07.2024, the informant allegedly received a phone call from Kundan Kumar threatening him and demanding Rs.10 lakh to save his life. The informant also disclosed that a separate land dispute case between Sanju Devi and the informant was already pending.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner by referring to the statement made in the anticipatory bail petition submits that the informant has already filed a Title Suit No.266 of 2023 before the Court of Civil Judge, Senior Division 2nd Patna City for specific performance of contract under agreement for sale dated 30.08.2022 and on having acquired the knowledge, the petitioner is said to have appeared and has denied the agreement, which is said to have been arrived at between the informant and this petitioner. It has next been submitted that after filing of title suit, the instant F.I.R., is said to have been registered for creating pressure while the disputes question in issue is pending consideration in the Title Suit No.266 of 2023. It is the case of the petitioner that petitioner is the owner of the land in question and has not entered into an agreement with any person and the allegations which are levelled in the title suit as



well as in the instant case, is out-rightly denied.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail application.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances that the petitioner is the owner of the land in question and has not entered into an agreement with any person and the allegations which are levelled in the title suit as well as in the instant case, are out-rightly denied, accordingly, this Court is inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his/her arrest or surrender before the Court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, 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 Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Patna City, in connection with Didarganj P.S. Case No.250 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure / Section 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita and with other following conditions:-

(i) one of the bailors should be the family member/relative of the petitioner(s) who shall provide official



document to show his/her bona fide;

(ii) the petitioner(s) shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of his/her/their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds;

(iv) the petitioner(s) shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of their bail bonds.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

sharun/-

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

