

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38246 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-194 Year-2018 Thana- KAHALGAON District- Bhagalpur

1. Raj Kumar Singh S/O Subodh Prasad Singh Resident of Village -Sheetal nagar Khutahari, Police Station Khalgaon, District- Bhagalpur
2. Arbind Kumar Nirala @ Arbind Kumar Singh S/O Late Rohin Mandal Resident of Village -Sadanandpur Baisa, , Police Station- Khalgaon, District- Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Dr. Manoj Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Gauri Shankar Gupta

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 27-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their arrest in Kahalgaon P. S. Case No.194 of 2018 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 144, 145, 147, 148, 149, 186, 283, 353, 504,109 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners, during the course of investigation, were given notice under Section 41(1) of the Cr.P.C. It is next submitted that during the course of investigation, the police never felt the need of arresting the petitioners, but then, in a mechanical manner submitted charge-sheet in the Year 2019 based on which



cognizance came to be taken, as such, the petitioners apprehend their arrest.

4. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that from perusal of the order impugned, it would manifest that petitioners earlier had moved before the learned District Court in the Year 2018 seeking anticipatory bail and the same was rejected, thereafter again petitioners twice moved before the learned District Court seeking anticipatory bail and the same was dismissed as withdrawn.

5. On query of the Court from the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners that as to when they approached the learned District Court seeking anticipatory bail for the second and third time, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that in the Year 2023 and 2024, on which learned A.P.P. submits that this amply demonstrates that these petitioners were moving at their leisure despite being aware that charge-sheet has been submitted and cognizance taken. It is next submitted that the conduct of the petitioners is such which does not entitle them for grant of anticipatory bail as if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioners may abscond and further delay the



framing of charge.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. The prayer of the petitioners for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

