

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53587 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-30 Year-2025 Thana- GORAUL District- Vaishali

1. Ranjeet Kumar @ Ranjeet Singh S/O Late Chandeshwar Singh R/O Village- Gorigama, P.S- Goraul, Distt.- Vaishali.
2. Gaurav Kumar S/O Harendra Singh R/O Village- Fatehpur, P.S- Goraul, Distt.- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anirudh Kumar Sinha, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anuj Kumar Shrivastava, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

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

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners, after arguing vehemently for some times realizing his difficulty, seeks permission to withdraw the anticipatory bail application with respect to petitioner no. 2 (Gaurav Kumar).

3. Permission is accorded.

4. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is dismissed as withdrawn with respect to petitioner no. 2 only.

5. The petitioner no. 1 apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 329(4), 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS read with Section 27 of the



Arms Act.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner no. 1 has antecedent of two cases and informant alleges that on account of dispute of PACS Chairman (Ranjeet Kumar) with her son Abhishek in a marriage, the accused persons came to her house looking for Abhishek, but he was not present thereafter accused left threatening and even fired in the air.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R., it would manifest that the informant alleges that her son had dispute with the petitioner in a marriage on account of which the occurrence is alleged to have been committed. It is next submitted that petitioner was not present at the place of occurrence when the occurrence is alleged to have been committed. It is next submitted that it does not appear probable that petitioner would have asked the accused persons to go and fire at the house of the informant. It is further submitted that petitioner will not abscond rather will co-operate in the investigation to prove his innocence.

8. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for



anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

9. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Goraul P.S. Case No. 30 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of BNSS.

10. However, it is made clear that in the event if the Investigating Officer of the case files an application before the learned Trial Court bringing to its notice that petitioner despite giving assurance to this Court is not co-operating in the investigation, in that event the learned Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

