

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.62194 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-52 Year-2025 Thana- Marnga District- Purnia

=====

Amar Kumar Singh @ Amir Singh S/o Prahlad Kumar Singh R/o Village-
Sarsi, P.S.- Sarsi, District- Purnea

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Akhauri Kamal Kishore Sahay

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Arun Kumar Pandey

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 07-11-2025 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 191(2),
191(3), 190, 111 and 109 of the BNS as well as Section 27 of
the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that his son Sakim along with Haider deal in sale and
purchase of land. Further, they got executed an agreement for
sale in their favour with regard to 2 acres of land. It is further
alleged that his son and Haider had gone on the land on
17.02.2025, when the informant got an information that 40-50
accused have gathered near the land, accordingly, he came to the
place of occurrence and heard gunshot and further on hearing



gunshot all 40-50 persons started fleeing thereafter it is alleged that informant saw that his son was shot in the mouth and Haider was also injured. It is next alleged that informant identified 18 named accused persons who were fleeing from the place of occurrence including the petitioner. Thereafter, the injured were taken to the hospital for treatment.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that no doubt, son of the informant received gunshot injury but then from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence. It is next submitted that since petitioner was also present at the place of occurrence along with other persons, as such, on hearing gunshot, he started fleeing. It is also submitted that neither the petitioner has any interest in the land nor the petitioner knew the son of the informant but then since he is a resident of a nearby village, as such, on seeing that people have gathered at the place occurrence, hence, out of inquisitiveness, he also came to the place of occurrence when the occurrence is alleged to have been committed. It is submitted that petitioner is not a criminal and will not abscond rather will cooperate in the



investigation to prove his innocence and will also cooperate in the trial.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, let the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/Successor Court in connection with Maranga P.S. Case No. 52 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

7. One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his father, namely, Prahlad Kumar Singh.

8. It is made clear that if the Investigating Officer of the case files an application before the learned trial court bringing to its notice that petitioner despite giving assurance to this court is not cooperating in the investigation in that event the learned trial court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.



9. It is further made clear that if charge-sheet is submitted and thereafter the learned trial court comes to a conclusion that petitioner is trying to delay the framing of charge or after framing of charge is trying to delay the trial of the case in any manner in both the conditions, the learned trial court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

