

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53337 of 2025
Arising Out of PS. Case No.-74 Year-2025 Thana- HILSA District- Nalanda

Ranjit Prasad, Son of Yugeshwar Prasad Village- Gulani PS- Hilsa District- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 1 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
8-08-2025 learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest in Hilsa P. S. Case No.74 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 190, 191(1), 191(2), 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 118(2), 109, 351(2) and 352 of the B.N.S. and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges that her husband was at Dalan of his cousin brother when accused persons came variously armed and Santosh fired causing injury on left side of the chest of her husband, thereafter, Narendra fired causing firearm injury on his left hand. Further, Prakash fired causing injury on his right leg while Chhotu and Sishupal fired but missed, thereafter petitioner fired



causing firearm injury to buffalo of her brother in-law, thereafter female accused pelted stones. Accordingly, police was informed and her husband was taken to hospital.

4. The 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 FIR, it would manifest that specific allegation of firing injuring the husband of the informant is against the named accused persons. As far as this petitioner is concerned, he is also alleged to have fired, but then, firearm injury was caused to her buffalo and not to the husband of the informant.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that though petitioner is not alleged to have fired at the husband of the informant, but then, allegation of firing is against him and it does not appear probable that petitioner intended to injure the buffalo rather it appears that his firing missed causing injury to the buffalo when all the named accused persons caused different firearm injury to the husband of the informant on different parts of the body.

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
---	---

