IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.51565 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-28 Year-2026 Thana- Panapur District- Muzaffarpur

==========

1. Ranjeet Kumar @ Ranjeet Kumar Rai Son of Shankar Ray @ Shankar Raut @ Shankar Rai R/o Village- Mani Phulkaha, P.O.- Raksa, P.S.- Panapur Kariyat, Dist.- Muzaffarpur.
2. Randhir Kumar Son of Shankar Ray @ Shankar Raut @ Shankar Rai R/o Village- Mani Phulkaha, P.O.- Raksa, P.S.- Panapur Kariyat, Dist.- Muzaffarpur.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mritunjay Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

3 20-08-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Panapur Kariyat P.S. Case No.28 of 2026 for allegedly having committed offences under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 117(2), 118(1), 109, 351(2)(3), 352 and 3(5) of B.N.S.

3. As per the First Information Report, which has been lodged on the basis of the written report submitted by the informant, to the effect that on the date of occurrence, while the informant was coming from his new house to his old house, in the meantime, at the door of Amin Miyan, all the accused persons, named in the First Information Report, including the

WEB COPY

petitioners herein, who are the agnates of the informant, came armed with stick and iron rod and started assaulting the informant on his head, hand and leg. Due to the assault, the informant suffered injuries on his head, his right hand got fractured and he also sustained injuries on his leg. After assaulting the informant, all the accused persons, including the petitioners fled away from there and thereafter with the help of his wife and villagers, he was taken to Kanti Government Hospital for treatment and from there he was referred to S.K.M.C.H., Muzaffarpur for better treatment.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and admittedly there is a dispute in between the parties for partition of the family property. He submits that the petitioners and the informant are agnates/brothers and no such occurrence has taken place. He submits that the dispute with regard to non-partition of the family property has led to institution of the present First Information Report. He further submits that although the occurrence is said to have taken place on 15.02.2026 and the statement was recorded on 16.02.2026, however the First Information Report was lodged on 26.02.2026 and no explanation whatsoever has been given for such delay in

WEB COPY

lodging the First Information Report. The learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that for settling the civil dispute, the present First Information Report has been lodged and he further submits that the petitioners have got no criminal antecedent.

5. *Per contra*, the learned A.P.P. appearing on behalf of the State, while opposing the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, submits that the informant suffered multiple injuries, out of which two injuries are grievous in nature and, therefore, the petitioners do not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Having considered the rival submissions and after going through the records, it appears that on account of dispute, which is admitted in the First Information Report itself, the accused persons, including the petitioners herein assaulted the informant brutally. From perusal of the injury report, which is appended with the case diary, it would transpire that the informant suffered four injuries, out of which, two injuries i.e. fracture of left frontal bone of the head and the fracture of right forearm have been found to be grievous in nature by the treating doctor. Although there is no specific allegation of assault against any of the petitioners, however one of the injuries, which has

WEB COPY

been found on the head of the informant, is opined to be grievous in nature.

7. Taking into consideration the facts aforesaid, this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners is rejected.

(Ritesh Kumar, J.)

Sanjay/-

U		T	

WEB COPY