

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14319 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-348 Year-2024 Thana- NADI P.S. District- Patna

=====

Arun Ray Son of Sitaram Ray Resident of Village - Kripal Tola, P.S.- Nadi,
District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shyamal Prakash, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Umesh Lal Verma, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Rajesh Ranjan, Adv.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 15-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State as also learned counsel for the Informant.
Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Nadi P.S. Case No. 348 of 2024 instituted for the offences
under Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3), 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 109,
76, 303(2), 329(4), 352, 351(2), 351(3) of the B.N.S.

3. As per prosecution case, the accusation against the
accused persons including the petitioner is of brutally assaulting
the Informant, her husband and her daughter-in-law with an
intention to kill them due to which they sustained injuries. It is
also alleged that the accused persons have also taken away
money and ornaments from the box kept in the house of the



Informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged against him and has falsely been implicated in the present case due to prior land dispute going on between the parties. There is a case and counter case between the parties. The present case is counter case of Nadi P.S. Case No. 349 of 2024. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no direct or specific allegation of any overt act against the petitioner rather the same is general and omnibus in nature. The specific allegation of assault is against the co-accused Dharmendra Rai and Pawan Kumar. The allegation of theft is also general and omnibus in nature. The petitioner has one criminal antecedent.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the co-accused Munnu Kumar has already been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 17.03.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 14423 of 2025.

6. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State and the Informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, stating that the offence alleged against the petitioner is serious in nature. He further submits that the incident has taken place on the order of the petitioner



and co-accused Munna Rai. The petitioner is named in the F.I.R. and, hence, he does not deserve bail.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature and gravity of the offence, there being direct allegation against the petitioner as also he being the order giver, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner, above named, is rejected. If the petitioner surrenders before the court below within a period of four weeks from today and prays for regular bail, the same would be considered by the court below in accordance with law without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

