

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59750 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-267 Year-2025 Thana- MANER District- Patna

=====

Veer Kumar @ Rohit Raj S/O Raj Kumar @ Raj Kumar Ray R/O - Jiwrakhan
Tola, P.S. - Maner, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ghanshyam Tiwary
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar No. 2

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 11-09-2025 1. Heard learned Senior counsel for the petitioner Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma and learned A.P.P. for the State.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Maner P.S. Case No.267/2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 310(2), 311 of the BNSS & Section 27 of the Arms Act.
3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that he along with Sunny and driver namely Vijay Kumar were coming back after collecting Rs.14 lacs, when they were intercepted by 4-5 unknown accused near a Shiv temple, further the accused broke the glass of the car and tried to pull the bag in which money was kept, on protest, an accused fired causing firearm injury on palm of the informant,



on hearing the sound of firing, people started gathering when the accused fled leaving the bag and informant was admitted in a hospital.

4. Learned Senior counsel submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that FIR was against unknown. It is also reiterated and submitted that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and his name transpired in the confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody, which does not have any evidentiary value.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that it is a case of road robbery but then the criminals were not successful in looting the informant for the reason that people started gathering at the place of occurrence and they had to flee but then an unknown accused fired causing firearm injury to the informant. It is also submitted that during course of investigation, the complicity of the driver of the informant surfaced and he was arrested and it was in his confessional statement that the name of the petitioner and other accused persons transpired. It is further submitted that investigation in the case is still continuing and in the event if the privilege of



anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Considering the submission made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

