

**In the Court of District & Addl. Sessions Judge , Biraul , Darbhanga.**

**Present**

**Shri Shiv Kumar  
District & Addl. Sessions Judge-Biraul**

**Darbhanga, dated, the 25<sup>th</sup> March 2026**

**Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 92/2026**

**Suhail Ahmad**

**.....Petitioner.**

**Versus**

**The State of Bihar**

**.....Opposite Party**

**Counsel for the petitioner :- Sri Rajneeh Kumar Pandey, Ld. Advocate.**

**Counsel for the State :- Sri Bachcha Rai, Ld. APP**

**ORDER**

**25.03.2026** The present anticipatory bail petition has been filed on behalf of petitioner who is apprehending his arrest namely 1.Suhail Ahmad @ Sohail Ahmad, S/o Farukh Ahmad in connection with C.R. Case No- 22/2019, for offence u/s 323, 341, 504, 420, 34 of IPC, which is pending in the Court of Ld. JMFC, Sri P.K. Pandit, Biraul, Darbhanga.

Heard Sri Rajneeh Kumar Pandey, the Ld. Counsel for the petitioner and Sri Bachcha Rai, Ld. APP on behalf of the State.

The prosecution story in short is that, the complainant grandfather, Gangadhar Poddar, divided the property among themselves. Subsequently, Bhola Paudar's heirs prepared the partition documents, and all signed the partition documents. On 25.07.2014, the complainant filed an application for mutation in the court of the C.O., Biraul, which mentioned 6 dhoor 18 Kanma. However, on the circle officer's order sheet dated 28.07.2014, the area order sheet again mentioned 1 Katha 9 dhoor 13 kanma. That it is further alleged that on 07.10.2014, while the case number 3 was verified by the Zonal Inspector with the cooperation of other cases, the total number of reports received, while the date 08.10.2014 was crossed out from the order and changed to 07.10.2014 as per their own wish, while the report of the Halka employee remained dated 08.10.2014 and was rejected due to various reasons. That it is further alleged that accused no-1 and 2 while the cases, in collusion, conspired to cut the order sheet of the case No-3 and other officials to benefit the accused No. 4 to 5.

That it is further alleged that complainant conspiring among themselves have made alteration of the mutation record in many places without any order of the officer and in favour of accused no.1 and 2 by making alterations here and there as per their own wish, which is clear from the record and by deceit and fraud, the accused have prepared it in their favour by agreeing among themselves, due to which the fiduciary plaintiff has suffered immense loss and on 15.12.2017, when accused was standing near the employee quarters on Ballia Road in Supaul market, accused No.3 called complainant and said that complainant was opposing him and started abusing complainant. When complainant protested, accused surrounded complainant and beat with slaps.

The Ld. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not committed any offence and he is quite innocent. The petitioner has falsely been implicated in this false case. That no such occurrence did ever take place as alleged in FIR. That there is no any criminal antecedents against the petitioner. That the date of occurrence is said to be have committed in the year 2014 and Nalsi has been filed on 25.01.2019. That ingredient of 420 IPC is not available in this case. That from perusal of statement of S.A enquiry witness only a case u/s 323, 504 IPC is applicable for which there is no injury at all. That this is complainant case and after cognizance this is the 1<sup>st</sup> appearance of the petitioner. That your petitioner is old and ill persons aged about 70 years. For that the petitioner is man of means and not likely to abscond and is ready to furnish the bail bonds to the satisfaction of the court, as such there is no chance of their absconding. So, it is prayed that accused person may be enlarge on anticipatory bail.

On the other hand Ld. APP appearing for the State opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

Heard, Submissions of both parties and perused the record and considering the discussion made above, petitioner has no criminal antecedents as stated by the counsel for petitioner. From the perusal of records it has been found that this is a complainant case and after cognizance this is the 1<sup>st</sup> appearance of the petitioner. That petitioner is old and ill person aged about 70 years. Considering the submissions made by the Ld. Counsel for petitioner as well as other facts and circumstances of the case the present anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner namely 1.Suhail Ahmad @ Sohail Ahmad, S/o Farukh Ahmad, ABP, is here by **Allowed**. On furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/-(Rs. Ten Thousands/-) with two sureties of like amount each to the satisfaction of the court, in connection with C.R. Case No-22/2019.

**(Dictated and Corrected)**

(Shri Shiv Kumar)  
District & Addl. Sessions Judge  
Biraul  
25.03.2026