

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.58617 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-211 Year-2025 Thana- GHOSI District- Jehanabad

Abhinash Aryan @ Abhinash Singh @ Praduman @ Dabla @ Avinash Aryan
S/o Gulab Bind R/o - Bhikha Chak P.S- Belaganj District- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Digamber Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umesh Lal Verma

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 08-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State along with learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Ghoshi P.S. Case No.211/2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 109 of the B.N.S.S. & Section 25(9)/27 of the Arms Act.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that in the marriage ceremony of the daughter of co-accused Vijay Bind, a dance programme was organized, further in the night, when the dance was being performed, the informant at 10.00 P.M. got an information that some unknown miscreants had opened fire causing firearm injury to his son as well as to



one minor villager, accordingly the informant reached the place of occurrence and brought his son to Ekangarsarai hospital, from where he was referred to PMCH, Patna for better treatment but the son of the informant during the course of treatment died.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner reiterates and submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent. It is next submitted that the FIR was against unknown and the name of the petitioner transpired during the course of investigation when the witnesses named the petitioner as the one who fired causing firearm injury to the son of the informant and to a minor. It is submitted that any statement recorded by the police is not admissible in evidence and has to stand the scrutiny of the trial.

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 informant had no intention of implicating an innocent person, since informant was not aware that who committed the occurrence, as such the FIR was instituted against unknown. It is submitted that police during the course of investigation recorded the statement of the witnesses who were present at the place of occurrence who disclosed the name of the petitioner as one who fired causing



firearm injury to two persons. It is also submitted that investigation in the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

