

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.7265 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-149 Year-2023 Thana- AWTARNAGAR District- Saran

1. Devanand Kumar @ Kumar Devanand S/O Basant Lal Ram @ Baswant Lal Ram R/O Village- Narav, Police Station- Awatarnagar, Distt.- Saran at Chapra.
2. Basant Lal Ram @ Baswant Lal Ram S/O Late Kira Ram R/O Village- Narav, Police Station- Awatarnagar, Distt.- Saran at Chapra.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shrinath Manjhi
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Binod Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 02-07-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Awatar Nagar P.S. Case No. 149 of 2023 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 307, 379 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have antecedent of one case, it is next submitted that petitioners are alleged to have come on a motorcycle with an unknown accused and on identification of informant by Basant (petitioner no. 2), the unknown accused fired causing firearm injury on chest of the informant and also took away his mobile



and Rs. 63,000/-.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that even presuming what has been alleged is true without admitting then allegation of firing is against the unknown accused. It is also submitted that the informant during the course of investigation has stated that on account of darkness, he was not able to identify the accused.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that though allegation of firing is against unknown, but then informant specifically alleges in the FIR that the unknown accused who was also sitting in the motorcycle along with the accused persons and petitioner no. 1 was driving the vehicle while petitioner no. 2 identified the informant, based on which the unknown accused fired causing firearm injury. It is next submitted that it appears that during the course of investigation the informant was threatened as such took a u-turn by stating that on account of darkness he could not identify the accused persons.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the



privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

