

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20871 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-597 Year-2024 Thana- RAMKRISHNANAGAR District- Patna

Anu Kumar @ Anurag @ Annu Kumar S/o Sunil Yadav Resident of Village- Sorangpur, P.S.- Ramkrishna Nagar, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sheo Kumar Prasad
For the State : Mrs. Veena Kumari Jaiswal, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

4 24-09-2025

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest for the offences alleged under Sections 103(1), 61(2), 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS and Section 27 of the arms Act, registered in connection with Ramkrishna Nagar P.S. Case No. 597 of 2024.

3. The informant, Annu Devi is the widow of the deceased Rajesh Singh. She lodged the FIR, stating therein that her husband Rajesh Singh was an eye-witness in Ramkrishna Nagar P.S.Case No. 225 of 2024. The accused persons named in the FIR were making pressure on the deceased not to depose in that case as an eye-witness; otherwise he would face dire consequences. It is alleged further that on 26.07.2022, co-accused Sonu Kumar, Mithu Kumar, Akashdeep, Ujjawal Kumar, besides 5-6 unknown miscreants, came to the house of the informant by motor-cycles. The accused persons, committed the murder of her husband by firing shot. The deceased died on way to the hospital.



4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated. His further submission is that the petitioner has not been identified in CCTV footage.

5. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the informant has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail, by submitting that the petitioner and other accused persons committed murder of the witness/deceased of that case pending against the accused persons and they, prior to commission of his murder, were exerting pressure for not recording his deposition in that case. It has further been submitted by the learned counsel for the informant that some persons were identified in CCTV footage, but some are still to be identified.

6. The investigation is still continuing.

7. In the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail, which is hereby rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

HR/-

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

