

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4233 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-439 Year-2024 Thana- MADHAURAH District- Saran

Anil Ray @ Anil Kumar Yadav S/O Rajdev Ray @ Rajdev Prasad Yadav  
Resident of Village- Lerua, P.S- Marhaura, District- Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Adarsh Ranjan

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Surendra Prasad Singh

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      12-02-2025                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection  
with Marhowrah P.S. Case No.439/2024 registered for the  
offences punishable under Sections 25(1-A), 25(1-AA), 25(1-  
B), (a), 26 and 35 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that  
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant  
alleges that he received secret information from his superior that  
petitioner and Anil indulged in manufacturing of illegal firearms  
and also indulged in its smuggling hence brick factory of  
Akhilesh was raided from where unprepared arms in huge  
quantity was recovered along with machinery for making arms  
were also seized from the place of occurrence. Further some  
accused were apprehended along with Akhilesh who disclosed  
that petitioner fled from the place of occurrence.



4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that petitioner was on an inimical term with Akhilesh as such he implicated him as petitioner was not returning an amount of Rs.3 lakh which he had taken from Akhilesh.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that in the anticipatory bail application it has not been pleaded as to what the petitioner does for his sustenance. Further it is also submitted that if the petitioner had taken an amount of Rs.3 lakh from a co-accused which he was not returning in that event it amply demonstrates that he was known to the co-accused, as such it is not a fit case for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail.

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

7. The anticipatory bail application is rejected.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

amit/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

