

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60131 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-136 Year-2025 Thana- SAHEBPUR KAMAL District-
Begusarai

=====

Amit Kumar S/o- Shailan Yadav @ Shailendra Yadav Village- S.Kamal Ps- S.
Kamal Dist- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shubhesh Pandey, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 15-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2),
115(2), 352, 351(1), 351(2), 109(1) and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023
read with Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of five cases and the informant alleges
that his son and Mantazeer were coming back home when they
were intercepted by Mukesh and Ravish along with 4-5
unknown accused, further Mukesh and Ravish started abusing
and when his son objected, they fired causing injury on right
and left chest and thigh of his son, further on alarm accused



persons fled when people gathered and Hifju identified one accused Rakesh also.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant, it is next submitted that petitioner is not named in the FIR and his name transpired in the confessional statement of Rajesh in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that specific allegation of firing is against Mukesh and Ravish and the informant does not allege that any third accused also fired.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State, Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of Rajesh. It is next submitted that no doubt petitioner is not alleged to have fired, but then he was present at the place of occurrence and since the petitioner has antecedent of five criminal cases, as such, the accused Mukesh and Ravish felt emboldened in committing the occurrence of firing. It is also submitted that injured received grievous injuries. It is next submitted that investigation of the case is in its nascent stages and if the privilege of anticipatory bail is



granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State and also taking into consideration the criminal antecedent of the petitioner, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

