

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 55527 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1132 Year-2023 Thana- ARARIA District- Araria

Galib @ Md. Galib S/o Md. Mojahid @ Mojahid Alam R/o vill - Dihiya,
Kamaldaha, P.S. - Araria, Distt. - Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjeet Choubey

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nawal Kishore Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 03-09-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 143, 447, 341, 323, 324, 307, 354, 379, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that petitioner assaulted Rafat by *farsa*, causing injury on head while Daud assaulted by *Dabia* to his family members while Ahmad assaulted him by *knife* near his eyes and also assaulted his sister by *knife* causing injury on hand



and Samsher by *lathi* assaulted his cousin brother.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that though it is alleged that petitioner assaulted the mother of Rafat by sword on head but then she has suffered injury on nose. It is thus submitted that the injury of Rafat does not corroborate the allegation of assault as alleged in the FIR.

5. The learned APP for the State Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that what is not disputed rather stands admitted is that Rafat suffered injury not on head but on nose. It is further submitted that FIR is not an encyclopedia of the events, it is next submitted that it may be a possibility that while petitioner assaulted Rafat she tried to save herself and accordingly got injury on her nose.

6. The learned APP further submits that since petitioner is alleged to have assaulted a woman, as such, petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



8. Accordingly, the prayer of anticipatory bail application for the petitioner stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J.)

Sudhanshu/-

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

