

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53521 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-37 Year-2025 Thana- SANGRAMPUR District- East
Champaran

-
1. Suraj Kumar S/o Manoj Patel Resident of village- Sangrampur, PS- Sangrampur, District- East Champaran
 2. Akash Kumar @ Buleti Kumar S/o Gajendra Patel Resident of village- Sangrampur, PS- Sangrampur, District- East Champaran
 3. Prakash Kumar S/o Rajiv Srivastav @ Ravish Srivastav Resident of village- Sangrampur, PS- Sangrampur, District- East Champaran
 4. Santosh Kumar S/o Bijli Patel Resident of village- Sangrampur, PS- Sangrampur, District- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shanti Bhushan Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ram Sumiran Rai- A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 19-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109, 74, 352, 191(2), 191(3),
190 of the B.N.S.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that
the petitioners have antecedent of one case and the informant
alleges that on 03.02.2025, the female members of the house at
5.30 A.M. were going to attend nature's call when accused



persons intercepted them and started behaving inappropriately. Further, when the son of the informant namely, Sujit came to save them, when he was stabbed by petitioner nos.1 and 3 causing injury on head. Thereafter, Golu and Dimpal Kumar stabbed his nephew Monu causing injury on head.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that the injuries suffered by the informant is opined to be lacerated, as such, the allegation that he was stabbed by knife gets belied. It is submitted that had the informant been assaulted by knife, in that event, the wound would have been incised, but then, the learned counsel for the petitioners fairly submits that the injuries suffered by Monu is opined to be incised. It is also submitted that there is no specific allegation of assault against petitioner nos.2 and 4.

5. Learned A.P.P. vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that there is specific allegation in the FIR that Golu and Dimpal Kumar assaulted Monu on head causing stabbed injury and the injury has been opined to be incised. It is next submitted that though the injury of the Sujit is opined to be lacerated, but then, the injury might not have been caused by stabbing, but then, Sujit definitely was assaulted. It is



also submitted that one can well imagine the plight of the women, who were going to attend nature's call that they were intercepted by such ruffian, who were acting inappropriately. It is also submitted that petitioner nos.2 and 4 might not have committed any overt act but were present at the place of occurrence and they did not make any endeavours to stop the accused from assaulting Sujit and Monu.

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 petitioners.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

