

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.45413 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-48 Year-2025 Thana- MOHANPUR District- Samastipur

Manjit Kumar @ Manjit Ray son of Naresh Ray Village -Dumari Dakshini
PS- Mohanpur, Dist- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Krishna Pd. Singh, Sr. Adv. Mr. Amit Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Raj Ballabh Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 15-11-2025 Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Krishna Prasad Singh; learned A.P.P. for the State, Mr. Raj Ballabh Singh and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(2), 109, 352, 351(2), 3(5) of the B.N.S. and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that he was going to attend to a patient when he was waylaid by the named accused persons, including the petitioner, and accused Mahesh Rai said that he is



the person who informed the police about illegal mining and liquor trade and thus gave orders to kill, upon which the accused persons opened fire, causing fire arm injury on his abdomen, and when Dilip came to save him, he was also shot, causing fire arm injury on his shoulder.

4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that on perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that no specific overt act is alleged against the petitioner of committing the occurrence of firing. As such, the allegations against the petitioner is not specific.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that what is not in dispute but rather stands admitted as per FIR is that two persons received firearm injuries, including the informant. It is also submitted that, no doubt, the occurrence of firing is not specific, but then the informant alleges that petitioner was also present at the place of occurrence, and his presence along with the other accused emboldened the other accused persons of committing the occurrence of firing, causing firearm injury. It is also



submitted that the investigation of the case is in nascent stages.

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)

Sudhanshu/-

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

