

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.58308 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-259 Year-2025 Thana- HILSA District- Nalanda

Suresh Kewat S/o Late Itwari Kewat R/o Village- Arpa, P.O. and P.S.- Hilsa,
District- Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Digamber Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Pawan Kumar Chaurasia

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 08-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State. None appears on behalf of the informant.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that he fired causing firearm injury on knee of the mother of the informant. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from perusal of the allegation, as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the case has not been instituted under the Arms Act. It is also submitted that the dispute in between the petitioner and the informant has been compromised.

3. The learned APP appearing on behalf of the State vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that no doubt from perusal of the FIR, it appears that



the same has not been instituted under the Arms Act but then there is specific allegation against the petitioner of causing firearm injury to the mother of the informant. It is also submitted that inadvertently Section 27 of the Arms Act may have been left out while registering the FIR. It is submitted that from perusal of the pleadings, as made in the anticipatory bail application, it would manifest that the same does not even remotely suggest that mother of the informant did not suffer firearm injury. It is next submitted that the police after investigation may pray before the court for adding Section 27 of the Arms Act or the court at the time of framing of charge may add. It is also submitted that investigation is continuing.

4. Considering the submissions made by learned APP for the State, this Court does not find any ground to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is hereby rejected in connection with Hilsa P.S. Case No.259 of 2025.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sanjay/-

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

