

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35922 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-341 Year-2019 Thana- JOKIHAT District- Araria

Guddu S/O Mohsin R/O Village- Dhanpura, P.S- Jokihat, Distt.- Araria.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Md. Naushaduzzoha, Adv.

Md. Nematullah, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

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

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Jokihat P.S. Case No. 341 of 2019 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 324, 325, 307, 354-B, 504, 506, 34 of the IPC.

3. As per prosecution case, petitioner is said to have assaulted the informant by means of farsa which hit below the eye due to which informant sustained injury.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier prayer for anticipatory bail of petitioner has been rejected by co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide Cr. Misc. No. 75202 of 2022 with an observation that if petitioner surrenders before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from the date of



order dated 05.04.2023 and prays for regular bail, the same shall be considered by the learned trial court on the same day without being prejudiced by this order. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner has not surrendered before the trial court within the stipulated time and on the basis of compromise which has taken place between the parties petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail on second occasion. Apart from that, petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned counsel on behalf of the State has submitted that there is specific allegation against the petitioner to have assaulted the informant by means of farsa which hit below the eye and the impugned order reveals that informant sustained sharp cut injury on his face which is grievous in nature. He further submits that earlier prayer for anticipatory bail of petitioner has already been rejected by co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide Cr. Misc. No. 75202 of 2022 and there is no ground to entertain the second anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegation levelled against the petitioner and the same is supported by injury report, as mentioned in impugned order and earlier prayer for anticipatory bail of petitioner has



already been rejected, I am not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner, is hereby, rejected.

7. However, if petitioner surrenders before the concerned court within six weeks from the date of receipt of the order and seeks regular bail, the concerned court may pass an appropriate order on the day of hearing without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

shahzad/-

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

