

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15837 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-10 Year-2024 Thana- MITHANPURA District- Muzaffarpur

Imran Ali @ Md. Imran Ali Son of Raja Ali Resident of Village -Chakvashu
Kachchi Sarai, PS- Mithanpura, Distt.- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dr. Bipin Chandra, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Rita Verma, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 16-04-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code as well as Sections 25(1-B)(a), 26 and 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of two cases and the informant alleges that petitioner along with a girl (victim) checked in the hotel of the informant and booked Room No. 215 on the pretext that they are husband and wife and have appointment with a Doctor. Further, after sometime, the victim came running out of the room and raised an alarm that she was shot by the petitioner on her cheek, accordingly, she was sent to the hospital and police was informed.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that for the same occurrence, two FIRs have been instituted and one of the antecedent of the petitioner is with respect to the same offence for which the police had instituted an FIR. It is next submitted that the instant FIR is the first FIR instituted by the owner of the hotel where petitioner along with the victim had gone to stay. It is also submitted that petitioner is having financial dispute with the owner of the hotel, as such, he came to be implicated falsely in the case. It is submitted that victim has not instituted any FIR.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that there is direct allegation against this petitioner of causing firearm injury to the victim. It is further submitted that from perusal of the order impugned, it would manifest that even injury report supported the allegation of firing, as such, it is submitted that though victim may not have instituted the FIR but then firearm injury was found in her medical examination.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Mithanpura



P.S. Case No. 10 of 2024 pending in the Court of learned
Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Muzaffarpur/Successor Court.

7. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

