

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.34306 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-667 Year-2024 Thana- BEGUSARAI TOWN District- Begusarai

Niraj Kumar @ Niraj Sah, S/o Parma Nand Sah, R/o Vill. - Mahmadpur, VTC
Mahammadpur, P.O.- Mirzapur Benduar, P.S.- Cheria- Bariarpur, Distt.-
Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pritish Kumar Lal, Advocate.
For the State : Mr. Nand Kishore Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 18-06-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The present petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner, apprehending his arrest, in connection with Begusarai Nagar P.S. Case No. 667 of 224 dated 18.12.2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 127(1), 115(2), 352, 351(2), 324(4), 3(5) and 109 of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita corresponding to Sections 147, 148, 141, 350, 109, 324, 350, 323, 312, 109 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per allegation, the accused persons were wielding illegal arms to damage the property of the informant and create fear. As transpires from the rejection order passed by



learned Sessions Judge, there is sufficient material in support of the allegation against the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that there is land dispute and hence, there is false implication and as per allegation, there is firing done by the accused persons while fleeing away.

5. It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the bail petition that the petitioner has not moved this Court earlier either for anticipatory bail or regular one in the instant case.

6. It has further been stated in paragraph no.3 of the petition that the petitioner has been made accused in two other cases in which he is on bail.

7. However, learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer of the Petitioner for bail submitting that as per the material on record, the accused persons were possessing arms without any license and they have wielded the arms to damage the property of the informant and create fear and hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail which is meant for protecting innocent persons from arrest.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am not persuaded to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.



9. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the
petitioner stands rejected.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

S.Ali/-

U			
---	--	--	--

