

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47650 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-493 Year-2024 Thana- SIMRI BAKHTIYARPUR District-
Saharsa

Love Kumar S/o Bilash Sharma R/o vill - Bariyarpur, P.s.- Bakhtiarpur
(Balwahat), Distt.- Saharsa

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Binod Kumar Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 30-07-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Bakhtiyarpur P.S. Case No.493/2024, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of the B.N.S. &
Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and has been falsely
implicated in the instant case, during the course of investigation,
based on confessional statement of apprehended accused. It is
next submitted that informant alleges that her husband was
killed and she was informed about the same by villager,
accordingly, she reached the place of occurrence, where she was
informed that the injured has been taken to the hospital, where



her husband died during the course of treatment. It is next submitted that confession in police custody does not have any evidentiary value. It is reiterated and submitted that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that no doubt name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody but then of late it is being seen that for petty amount contracts are being taken and murders are being committed. It is also submitted that investigation is in its nascent stages, as such, if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond. It is next submitted that the anticipatory bail application also does not disclose that as to what the petitioner does.

5. Considering the submission made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

