

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.58252 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-97 Year-2025 Thana- KAHALGAON District- Bhagalpur

=====

Ganesh Yadav Son of Banke Yadav R/o Village - Gamaharpur, P.S. -
Kahalgaon, District - Bhagalpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State OF Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Krishna Prasad Singh, Sr. Adv. Mr. Rakesh Singh, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Anish Chandra, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 04-09-2025 1. Heard learned Senior counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Krishna Prasad Singh and learned A.P.P. for the State.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Kahalgaon P.S. Case No. 97 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 109, 74, 303(2), 191(2), 115(2), 126(2), 329(4) and 352 of the BNS, 2023 read with Section 27 of the Arms Act.
3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges that accused persons entered her house and started assaulting her, further petitioner, Shekhar and Diwakar fired indiscriminately causing firearm injury to her son, Shivam on



leg, thereafter accused Moti and Arvind assaulted by an iron rod and the accused persons committed theft of ornaments and cash of Rs. 25,000/-.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from side of the petitioner, Kahalgaon P.S. Case No. 98 of 2025 has been instituted against the informant and his side. It is also submitted that though there is allegation of firing against the petitioner, but then the allegation is not specific, as informant alleges that petitioner along with Shekahr and Diwakar fired causing firearm injury on leg of her son. It is also submitted that the son of the informant only suffered one firearm injury when allegation is of indiscriminate firing.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that allegation may not be specific, but then what is not disputed rather stands admitted is that son of the informant received firearm injury on his leg and petitioner is also alleged to have fired along with Shekhar and Diwakar. It is also submitted that even presuming petitioner did not fire, but then his presence emboldened other accused persons to committed the occurrence. It is also



submitted that investigation of the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, 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	
---	--	---	--

