

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.62155 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-115 Year-2025 Thana- BHAGWANPUR District- Kaimur
(Bhabua)

=====

Sintu Pathak @ Mithilesh Pathak S/O Ghanshyam Pathak Resident of
Village- Singhi, P.S.- Belaon (Bhagwanpur), District- Kaimur at Bhabua.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Praveen Kumar
		Mr. Uday Pratap Singh
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Dr. Mrityunjaya Kr.Gautam

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 23-12-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in Bhagwanpur P. S. Case
No.115 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109, 352, 351(2), 3(5) 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, but then, the said
offence was instituted under minor Sections of the I.P.C. It is
further submitted that informant alleges that he had given
Rs.54,000/- to petitioner, who was not returning the money.
Further, the informant had gone to attend a marriage at village
Bahuri, where Abhay came and on the pretext of returning the



money, took him near a temple where named accused persons were present from before in a drunken state and petitioner fired causing injury on his stomach while Ishwar fired causing firearm injury on chest of Antu.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant alleges that petitioner had taken Rs.54,000/- from the informant and was not returning and when petitioner was in a marriage function when Abhay came and on pretext of returning the money, called him to a place where petitioner along with others were present and petitioner fired causing firearm injury on his stomach while Ishwar fired at Antu causing firearm injury on his chest. It is submitted that injury report of Antu records the injury to be simple caused by hard and blunt substance, thus allegation of firing is negated. It is next submitted that even injury of informant is opined to be simple caused by firearm, as such, petitioner never had any intention of committing a serious occurrence. It is also submitted that since there was an existing dispute in between the petitioner and the informant relating to money, as such, it might be a possibility that petitioner came to



be implicated in the instant case only with a view to coerce him into submission. It is also submitted that petitioner is in custody since 09.05.2025.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the bail application and submits that no doubt, the injury of the informant has been opined to be simple in nature, but then, the same was caused by firearm and if privilege of bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for bail stands rejected.

8. However, petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

