

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28750 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-276 Year-2024 Thana- AURAI District- Muzaffarpur

Vijay Sah S/o Radhey Shyam Sah @ Radhe Sah R/o Village- Sarhanchiya,
P.S.- Aurai, Distt.- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pradeep Kumar Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 06-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in Aurai (Muzaffarpur) P.
S. Case No.276 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable
under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 127(2), 109, 124(1), 74, 332(b),
352, 351(2), 351(3) and 3(5) of the B.N.S.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in custody
since 01.01.2025 and petitioner is alleged to have thrown acid
on informant's cousin mother in-law which was handed over to
him by Munchun causing burn injury. It is further alleged that
other family members also received burn injuries when they
tried to save the informant while Munchun assaulted Shanti
Devi by an iron rod causing injury on her head.



4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that though it is alleged that petitioner threw acid on the cousin mother in-law of the informant, but then, the injury suffered by the injured is simple in nature. It is also submitted that petitioner and the informant are agnates and are having dispute.

5. Learned A.P.P. Sri Rabindra Kumar opposes the bail application and submits that no doubt, the injury suffered by the injured is simple in nature as would manifest from Annexure-2 to the bail application, but then, the doctor has opined that the injury was caused by acid. It is next submitted that carrying acid and throwing the same in itself does not entitle the petitioner to be released on bail for the present.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

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

8. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

