

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53638 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-298 Year-2025 Thana- MASAUDHI District- Patna

=====

Gyan Ranjan @ Gyan Ranjan Chaudhary S/o Shambhu Prasad Chaudhary
R/o Village - Gonjarchak, P.S- Chandi, District Nalanda At present Mohalla
Hospital Road, Bartan Gali, P.S - Masaurhi, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Anirudh Kumar Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Kumar Ranjit Ranjan

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 20-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest
in Masaurhi P. S. Case No.298 of 2025 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 103(1) and 61(2) of 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 his nephew was shot dead by unknown criminals.
4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case based on
confessional statement of apprehended accused. It is also
submitted that one Sunny Kumar, who claims to be an eye witness
to the occurrence did not name the petitioner, nor disclosed the



name of any of the accused in the FIR, but in course of investigation, he divulged the name of three accused, who were arrested and based on the confessional statement of apprehended accused, the name of the petitioner transpired. It is also submitted that petitioner is not land broker rather runs a medical shop at Masaurhi.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that nephew of the informant was killed. It is also submitted that since the FIR was instituted against known, as such, during the course of investigation, the police apprehended some accused and based on their confessional statement, the name of the petitioner transpired. It is next submitted that the investigation in its nascent stages and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., 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	
---	--	---	--

