

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47577 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-534 Year-2024 Thana- ARA NAWADA District- Bhojpur

Bikku Kumar @ Bhulan Yadav S/O Bheekhar Yadav R/O Village- Bahiro,
P.S- Nawada, Distt.- Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Ms. Malti Kumari
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Binod Kumar- A.P.P.
	Mr. Ravindra Kumar
	Ms. Devyani Shekhar
	Mr. Sanjeet Kumar

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER**

- 2 30-07-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest in Ara Nawada P. S. Case No.534 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 127(1), 115(2), 109, 352 and 351(3) of the B.N.S. and Section 27 of the Arms Act.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that accused persons intercepted them near a mango orchard and Raushan pointed pistol and threatened not to



inform the police regarding sale of liquor. Thereafter, Golu fired causing injury on left side of the chest and under shoulder. Further, Raushan fired causing injury to him and Arjun. Thereafter, Bittu assaulted by butt of pistol on head and temple of Adarash while Pankhuri Yadav also fired indiscriminately. It is next alleged that informant fell and became unconscious on account of injury and regained consciousness in the hospital.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the specific allegation of firing is against Golu and Raushan. It is next submitted that petitioner is not alleged to have committed any overt act rather the only allegation against the petitioner is that he was present at the place of occurrence.

5. Learned A.P.P. as well as learned counsel for the informant opposes the anticipatory bail application. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that informant during the course of treatment subsequently died. It is next submitted that no doubt, petitioner is not alleged to have caused firing, but then, he was present at the place of occurrence with other accused persons which emboldened the other accused



of committing the occurrence of firing and injuring the victim leading to his death.

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

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

