

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60108 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-139 Year-2025 Thana- CHARPOKHARI District- Bhojpur

1. Munna Kumar @ Munna Kumar Rai @ Kumar Aniket S/o Late Biswanath Bhatt R/o vill- Balbandh, P.S.- Charpokhari, Distt.- Bhojpur, ara
2. Amit Kumar @ Amit Kumar Ray @ Ankit S/o Surendra Ray @ Surendra Bhatt R/o vill- Balbandh, P.S.- Charpokhari, Distt.- Bhojpur, ara

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raj Kishor Prasad, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Sevak Choudhary, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 15-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, Mr. Rajiv Verma.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115, 118(2), 352, 351(2), 109, 303(2) and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and informant alleges that while he was returning to his house from temple when seven named accused persons including the petitioners intercepted him and Munna, Anshu and



Amit caught him and on orders of Munna, accused Amit assaulted him by an iron rod causing injury on eye and thereafter all the accused assaulted by *lathi* and *danda* and Anshu snatched chain worth Rs. 4 Lakhs, further the accused also assaulted Sanjiv who came to save him.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have 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 informant alleges that on orders of Munna, Amit assaulted by an iron rod causing injury on eye, but then it is submitted that no injury report is on record and Munna has been implicated as an order giver.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of the Informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners. The learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submit that a counter affidavit has been filed wherein it has been specifically pleaded that on account of assault, the informant lost his eyesight permanently and there is specific allegation against Amit of assaulting on orders of Munna. It is further submitted that even process under Section 82 Cr.P.C has been issued



against the petitioner.

6. On query of the Court from the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that as to whether any process under Section 82 Cr.P.C. has been issued or not, the learned counsel for the petitioner does not rebut the said submission.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of the informant and also taking into consideration the fact that process under Section 82 Cr.P.C. has been issued against the petitioner, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

