

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36396 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-50 Year-2025 Thana- KATIHAR MUFFASIL District- Katihar

Md. Mustaque S/o Md. Salam R/o Village- Khodwa, P.S.- Mufassil Thana,
District- Katihar, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Mrityunjay Kumar Mr. Ravi Ranjan
For the Informant	:	Mr. Yatindra Narayan
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Md. Matloob Rab

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

4 19-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the

learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant as well as

Learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Katihar Muffasil P.S. Case No. 50/2025, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 115(2)/126(2)/109/352/
351(2)/303(2) and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. As per the prosecution case, informant Md. Ibrar
on the basis of an agreement for purchase of the plot went for its
measurement then the accused persons named in the F.I.R.
including the petitioner and unknown persons came there armed
with weapons and started abusing him. They also started
assaulting the informant. Co-accused Md. Salam assaulted
brother of the informant with iron-rod on his head who suffered
injuries and became unconscious. The petitioner snatched
golden chain of Rupees One Lakh from the brother of the



informant.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated. He submitted that although the brother of the informant has suffered grievous injury that injury is not assigned to the petitioner rather it is assigned to co-accused Md. Salam. He further submitted that there is land dispute and title suit between the parties.

5. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the informant, has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail by submitting that the petitioner after getting the privilege for no coercion, opened fired at the house of the informant which came in the case diary. He also submitted that the petitioner has disclosed two criminal antecedents in his supplementary affidavit but suppressed one case i.e. Katihar Muffasil P.S. Case No. 117/2014.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail. It is, accordingly, rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Saif/-

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

