

-

**In the Court of Sessions Judge,Bijnor.**

**Bail application no. 2221/2026**

**1-Sher Singh s/o Mukandi,**

**2-Arun s/o Sher Singh,**

**3-Mohit s/o Sher Singh all residents of Village Ameenabad P.S  
Seohara,Distt.Bijnor.**

**Vs.**

**State**

**U/ss:109(1) and 351(3)BNS**

**P.S : Seohara, Bijnor.**

**Crime no. 104/2026**

**ORDER**

The above noted first application for bail has been moved on behalf of the applicant-accused **Sher Singh,Arun and Mohit** who are involved and detained in above stated crime number and sections.

Per prosecution complainant lodged a report that on 3.4.2026 at about 7.00 AM Tonga belonging to Narpat was standing at the place of Sher Singh and Sher Singh had stationed his Tonga at his place. He talked to Sher Singh but Sher Singh,Arun,Mohit etc on the basis of their muscle power having armed with lathi danda and sharp edged weapon came to his home and while hurling abuses committed marpit with him and gave the blow of danda on the head of Rishipal Singh and accused Mohit Kumar gave the blow of iron rod on the head of Bhagwant and caused injuries on them.

Heard the learned counsel for the accused-applicant as well as learned DGC(Crl.)for the State and perused the record.

It is submitted on behalf of the accused-applicants that they have been implicated falsely in this case. Initially the case was registered under section 110,115(2) and 352 BNS but later on sections 109(1),351(3) BNS were added. The FIR is delayed and unexplained. They have not committed marpit with the injured.

DGC(Crl.) for the State opposed the bail and submitted that the applicants-accused alongwith co-accused persons committed marpit with the injured causing them injuries alongwith fracture on head.

In this case, it is alleged that there have been named four accused - persons. It is also alleged that there are two injured persons in this case and one of the injured has sustained fracture of parietal bone. It is alleged that initially the case was registered under section 110, 115(2) BNS and the applicants-accused were granted anticipatory bail but later on it was converted into section 109(1) BNS. It is also alleged that during the period of anticipatory bail, the applicants-accused did not misuse the liberty of anticipatory bail and they have cooperated the investigation. It is also alleged that at present the injured persons are not said to have been admitted in any hospital for their treatment. They are said to have been present at home. It is also alleged that there is cross case and at this stage it cannot be said as to who was aggressor. The applicants-accused have been serving in jail since 19.6.2026 and prosecution could not show any criminal antecedent against the applicants-accused.

Under the facts and circumstances of the case without commenting much on merit of the case, I find it a fit case for bail.

Let the applicants-accused be enlarged on on their filing a PB of Rs. 50,000/- and two sureties each in like amount to the satisfaction of Magistrate concerned.

**(Sanjay Kumar VII)**

Sessions Judge,

Bijnor.

10.07.2026