

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52424 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-65 Year-2025 Thana- DUMARIAGHAT District- East
Champaran

=====

Satendra Pandey @ Satyendra Pandey S/o Bashisth Pandey @ Vashisth
Pandey Resident of Village - Rampur Kharjuriya, P.S.- Dumariyaghat, Dist.-
East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhishek Kumar
Mr. Hemant Ray

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Aslam Ansari
Mr. Madhurendra Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 19-09-2025 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 Dumariyaghat P. S.

Case No.65 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under

Sections 191(2), 190, 352, 351(2), 126(2), 115(2), 118(1),

109(1), 117(2), 303(2), 74 of the B.N.S.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that

Tez Narayan Pandey had approached this Court seeking

anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.52362 of 2025 and the

same came to be allowed by an order dated 19.09.2025. It is

next submitted that the petitioner is seeking regular bail, on



which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that petitioner has antecedent of five cases and the case of the petitioner is not on a similar footing as that of Tez Narayan Pandey as Tez Narayan Pandey was granted the privilege of anticipatory bail for the reason that no specific allegation of assault was alleged against him, but as far as this petitioner is concerned, there is specific allegation of assaulting Abhishek causing grievous injury on vital part of the body, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that on account of dispute relating to pathway the occurrence is alleged to have taken place.

4. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant as well as the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail, who is in custody since 08.04.2025.

5. The prayer of the petitioner for regular bail stands rejected.

6. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

