

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24422 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-17 Year-2024 Thana- DHAUDAD District- Rohtas

=====

Purnavasi Yadav @ Purnavasi Kumar S/o Saryu Yadav @ Sarju Singh R/o vill
- Dhankaraha (Dhankadha), P.O.- Dhaudadh, P.S.- Dhaudadh, Distt.- Rohtas
at Sasaram

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Jai Prakash Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ram Priya Sharan Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 02-05-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in Dhaudadh P. S. Case No.17 of 2024 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 127(1), 115(2),
303(2), 109, 351(2), 352, 117(2), 190 of Bharatiya Nyaya
Sanhita and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant
alleges that on account of dispute relating to payment of
sugarcane, the accused persons assaulted him causing fracture
of left hand finger, thereafter Pintu, Dharamjeet and petitioner
came and fired on account of which, cousin brother of the



informant received one firearm injury.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant alleges that Pintu, Dharamjeet along with the petitioner fired, but then only one firearm injury was received by the injured which cast an aspersion on the case of the prosecution. Further, the allegation is also not clear that by whose firing, the cousin brother of the informant was injured.

5. Learned A.P.P. vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner and submits that petitioner has antecedent of one case and he is alleged to have fired along with Pintu and Dharmajeet. It is also submitted that the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has rightly submitted that it is not clear by whose fire, the injured received firearm injury, but then, the presence of petitioner is being alleged at the place of occurrence and as such, the petitioner did not make any endeavour to stop the other co-accused persons from firing. It is reiterated and submitted that it is not in dispute that cousin brother of the informant had received firearm injury. It is also submitted that investigation of the case is in its nascent



stages and in the event, if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

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.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

