

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26360 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-49 Year-2025 Thana- LAHERIMUHALLA District- Nalanda

D.K. Singh @ Dharmendra Kumar Singh S/o Late Nageshwar Singh R/o vill -
Darogagarh, P.S.- Deep Nagar, Distt.- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shivendra Prasad

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 18-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 318(2), 319(2), 338, 336(3) and 340(2) of the B.N.S.
and Sections 25(1-b)a, 26 and 35 of the Arms Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the
informant alleges that during vehicle checking on 28.01.2025, a
Scorpio was stopped, in the car, Prashant Kumar was sitting
along with his two bodyguards namely Satyendra and Ramjee,
who were carrying gun with cartridges. Further, the bodyguards
showed their arm license and on license of Satyendra, there was
no signature while license of Ramjee, bore signature of the



authority, but spelling of Lucknow on the license was mis-spelt which created suspicion. Further, Prashant disclosed that he hired the bodyguard from M. Security Service owned by the petitioner. It is next alleged that the license were sent for verification and the Arms Magistrate informed that no license found for the UIN Number mentioned on the license, as such, the UIN Number was invalid.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant based on suspicion. It is next submitted that no doubt, Identity Card of the bodyguard was issued by the office of the petitioner, but then, neither the petitioner nor his office was instrumental in getting fake arm license issued in favour of the aforesaid bodyguard. It is submitted that bodyguard had approached the Security Company of the petitioner and after perusing their license, the Identity Card was made. It is submitted that had the petitioner been aware that the license is fake, then Identity Card of the company would not have been issued in their name as the name would have created evidence against the petitioner and his company of issuing I-Card based on fake license.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail



application.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, is directed to be released on anticipatory bail on his furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned CJM, Nalanda, Bihar Sharif in connection with Laheri P. S. Case No.49 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

