

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32913 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-7 Year-2024 Thana- SAMASTIPUR MUFFASIL District-  
Samastipur

=====

Anjani Kumar S/o Bhikhari Pal R/o Village- Pahepur (Raj Khand), P.S.-  
Muffassil, District- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rudrank Shivam Singh  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Yogendra Kumar

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

- 2      20-06-2025                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
A.P.P. for the State as well as learned counsel appearing on  
behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with  
Samastipur (Muffasil) P.S. Case No.07/2024, registered for the  
offences punishable under Sections 452, 324, 307, 504, 506,  
120B of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that  
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in custody  
since 07.01.2024 and this is the second attempt of the petitioner  
to seek bail. It is next submitted that co-accused Manjay Pal had  
approached this Court seeking bail by filing Cr. Misc.  
No.27347/2024 and the same was rejected by an order dated



21.06.2024 on the ground that there is a specific allegation against Manjay Pal and petitioner of firing twice causing injury to the father-in-law of the informant near his eye and hand. It is next submitted that Manjay Pal again moved this Court seeking regular bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.88175/2024 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 11.04.2025, as such, it is submitted that petitioner be also released on bail based on parity.

4. The learned APP and the learned counsel for the informant opposes the bail application of the petitioner. The learned counsel for the informant submits that Manjay Pal was granted the privilege of regular bail for the reason that the injured, who was examined had specifically stated that son of Bhikhari fired causing injury near his eye and did not take the name of Manjay Pal. It is also submitted that petitioner is son of Bhikhari and the injured in the trial has named the petitioner, hence in the event if the privilege of bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

5. In view of the submission made by the learned APP and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

6. The bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

7. However, if the trial is not concluded within a



period of seven months from today, in that event, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail, as it has been submitted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner Mr. Rudrank Shivam Singh that out of six witnesses four witnesses have been examined.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

