

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.37556 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-274 Year-2014 Thana- BEGUSARAI MUFFASIL District-
Begusarai

=====

Bablu @ Kumar Gaurav S/o Raj Kumar Pandit R/o Vill- Sitarampur,
Dhobauli, Ward No. 02, P.S.- Lakho, Dist- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kumar Binode Bariar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar No. 1, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 25-06-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148,
149, 324, 384, 386, 307, 447 and 364 of the Indian Penal Code
as well as Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned A.P.P. at the outset submits that it is not a
fit case where anticipatory bail be granted to the petitioner for
the reason that the FIR is of the year 2014 and the petitioner
moved before the learned District Court for seeking anticipatory
bail in 2025, i.e., after a delay of 11 years on which learned
counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that
petitioner was implicated in the case by the name Bablu, Son of
Raj Kumar Pandit. It is further submitted that Raj Kumar Pandit



has three sons but then none of them is named Bablu. It is next submitted that father of the petitioner, after institution of the instant FIR, had approached the police officials for seeking information that as to which of his son has been implicated in the instant case on which no positive reply came, as such, neither the petitioner nor his brothers approached the learned District Court for seeking anticipatory bail when all other accused in the instant case have been granted the privilege of regular bail.

4. Learned A.P.P. rebuts the said submissions of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and submits that the said stand has been taken only to make out a case. It is further submitted that it might be a possibility that petitioner was nicknamed Bablu but then in the pleadings made in the anticipatory bail application a very generalized pleading has been made that the father of the petitioner insisted before the police that none of his son is named Bablu but then there is no clear pleading in the anticipatory bail application to the effect that petitioner is not known by the nickname Bablu.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. and also taking into consideration the pleadings made at para 10 of the anticipatory bail application that rest of the



accused have been granted the privilege of regular bail, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Begusarai Mufassil P.S. Case No. 274 of 2014 pending in the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Begusarai/Successor Court.

6. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

