

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.42775 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-233 Year-2024 Thana- JADIA District- Supaul

Pravesh Kumar @ Pravesh Yadav S/o Late Umesh Prasad Yadav @ Umesh
Yadav R/o Village- Navdihi, Ward No 08, Police Station- Jadia, District-
Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Digvijay Narayan Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Dr. Ajeet Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 09-12-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Jadia P.S. Case No. 233 of 2024 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 127(7), 115(2),
117(2), 74, 109(1), 303(2), 352 and 351(2) of the BNS, 2023
read with Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that 20.12.2024 at 07:30 PM while he was at his home
with his family members when 17 named accused persons
including the petitioner along with 20-25 unknown accused
came and Rajesh gave orders to shoot and loot when Shailesh



caught him and Pravesh fired causing injury on waist of his wife while accused persons fired causing injury on leg of Mohan, further Anshu assaulted his *Bhabhi*, Rekha by arrow causing injury on hand, next alleges that Rajesh, Shailesh and Vikash were assaulting while other accused were looting, it is next alleged that accused had come on two four wheelers and several motorcycles and even assaulted his mother.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that though informant alleges that petitioner fired causing firearm injury on waist of his wife, but then from perusal of the injury report, it would manifest that the wife of the informant is alleged to have received firearm injury on her back. It is also submitted that whenever any firearm injury is caused, there is an entry and an exit wound, but in the case of the injured, no such entry or exit wound has been recorded which casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution that as to whether the wife of the informant even received firearm injury. It is also submitted that no reason for the occurrence is alleged.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that there is a



specific allegation against this petitioner of causing firearm injury to the wife of the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the injury report of the injured, it would manifest that doctor has found firearm injury on body of the injured and the wound is lacerated and has been opined to be grievous. It is further submitted that whether entry or exit wound is there or not, is an aspect of investigation and trial and the same at the stage of anticipatory bail cannot be considered when there is specific allegation against the petitioner of causing firearm injury.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

