

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.46838 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-48 Year-2025 Thana- Amhara P.S. (I.I.T.A. Bihta) District- Patna

Nand Kumar Verma, aged about 45 years (male), son of Late Ram Deel
Verma, resident of village - Rajpur, P.S- I.I.T. Amhara, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Akshansh Ankit, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Raj Kishor Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 30-07-2025 Heard Mr. Akshansh Ankit, learned counsel

appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mr. Raj Kishor Singh,

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in connection
with I.I.T. Amhara P.S. Case No. 48 of 2025, registered for the
offence punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109, 352,
351(2) and 5 of the B.N.S. and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the allegation made in the FIR, petitioner
along with other accused persons had assaulted the informant
and his nephew. Specific allegation against the petitioner is that
he had opened fire upon the informant causing fire-arm injury



on his leg.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Due to enmity, the petitioner has been made accused in the present case. There is case and counter case between the parties. Both the parties were indulged into fierce-fight and the petitioner, in his self defence, may have caused injury to the persons of the informant, without intention. Learned counsel further submitted that all the cases, which have been given in paragraph no. 3 of the bail application, are of the year 2014-15 and now the petitioner is a man of dignity. No fire-arm injury, as alleged in the FIR, has been caused to the informant, nor any such injury report has been brought on record by the informant during investigation to support his version. On these grounds, petitioner seeks to be released on pre-arrest bail.

5. Learned APP for the State submitted that sufficient materials have surfaced in course of investigation and petitioner doesn't deserve to be released on pre-arrest bail.

6. Considering the rival submissions made on behalf of the parties, as well as, the allegations made in the FIR, in which, it has been alleged that the petitioner had opened fire



upon the informant causing fire-arm injury on his leg, I find that learned District Court has not called for the injury report to verify and simply rejected the bail application of the petitioner. Specific case of the petitioner is that the petitioner has been made accused in the present case as a consequence of two cases lodged by the petitioner side relating to IIT Amhara P.S. Case No. 47 of 2025 and IIT Amhara P.S. Case No. 49 of 2025. I am of the opinion that petitioner has, *prima facie*, made out a case to be released on pre-arrest bail.

7. Learned District Court is directed to call for the injury report relating to the informant and if it is found that the injury sustained by the informant is simple in nature, the petitioner, above named, is directed to be released on pre-arrest bail, in the event of his/her arrest or surrender before the learned District Court within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate- I, Danapur/ court concerned, in connection with I.I.T. Amhara P.S. Case No. 48 of 2025, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

8. The learned District Court is directed to verify



the criminal antecedent of the petitioner as stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail application. If any other case is pending against the petitioner as what has been stated in paragraph no. 3, this order will lose its force automatically.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Niraj/-

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

