

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.27416 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-117 Year-2024 Thana- HASANPUR District- Samastipur

Arun Yadav @ Arun Kumar Yadav Son of Bhola Yadav R/O Village -
Bagraha, P.S.- Hasanpur, District - Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bindeswari Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Satyendra Narayan Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 13-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Hasanpur P.S. Case No. 117 of 2024 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 352, 351(2), 109,
3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Section 27 of the Arms
Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of four cases and the informant alleges
that petitioner along with Kailash came and both fired causing
firearm injury on the right hand of the son of the informant.

4. It is next submitted 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 two accused persons came including the petitioner and both fired, but then only one firearm injury was suffered by the son of the informant, it is thus submitted that as such the allegation that who fired causing firearm injury is not alleged with certainty.

5. The learned APP opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that son of the informant suffered firearm injury and the accused persons are alleged to have fired. It is also submitted that even presuming what has been submitted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner to be true, then also the presence of the petitioner at the place of occurrence is not disputed and the petitioner carries antecedent of four cases.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

