

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47942 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-55 Year-2025 Thana- KANTI District- Muzaffarpur

Rohit Kumar Nirala @ Kallu S/o Ramekbal Thakur R/o Vill- Repura, P.S.-
Karza, Distt- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amitesh Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mrs. Rita Verma, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 19-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP
for the State and perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner apprehends arrest in connection with
Kanti P.S. Case No. 55 of 2025, registered under Sections
126(2), 118(1), 109, 61(2), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,
2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the informant
was shot in the knee near Repura High School by four co-
accused persons including the petitioner, after being chased on
motorcycles. Earlier, on 10.02.2025, liquor was recovered from
one Sujit Kumar Chaudhary, following which the accused had
threatened the informant. Police recovered four empty cartridges
from the spot and prepared a seizure list.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that there is delay of two days in lodging the FIR. It is next submitted that the allegation of firing against the petitioner is totally false and concocted. The petitioner has got no concern with the alleged occurrence and there is no any eye witness of the said occurrence. The petitioner has got no criminal antecedent. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that other co-accused has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 22.07.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 45454 of 2025.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that there is specific allegation of firing against the petitioner and the same has been supported by the informant and witnesses in paragraph nos. 3, 4, 5 and 21 of the case diary. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. However, the petitioner is



directed to surrender in the Court below and pray for regular bail. If any such application is filed, the Court below shall consider and dispose of the same on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

