

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.65627 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-214 Year-2024 Thana- KALYANPUR District- Samastipur

Prabhat Kumar Chaudhary @ Prabhat Kumar S/o Sanjay Choudhary Resident
of Village- Nim Chak Haider, P.S.- Chakmehasi, Dist- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anish Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Zainul Abedin

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 08-10-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Kalyanpur P.S. Case No.214/2024, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 189(2),
191(2), 324(4)(5), 326, 132, 352 of the B.N.S. and Sections 3, 4
of Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of 13 cases and has been falsely
implicated in the instant case by the informant because of his
antecedents. It is next submitted that in sum and substance the
informant alleges that he received an information about a dead
body, accordingly he reached the place of occurrence where a
mob had gathered and the petitioner was leading the mob which
created great inconvenience to passerby including vehicles and
the petitioner asked for petrol so that the same can be sprinkled



and the vehicles be damaged but then the informant and the force controlled the situation.

4. Learned counsel submits that though it is alleged that petitioner was leading the mob and created disturbance but then a dead body was found at the place of occurrence, as such the villagers had gathered and the petitioner also being a native of the same place, out of inquisitiveness, came to the place of occurrence, when he came to be implicated.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that petitioner has antecedent of 13 cases and in the event if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond and investigation in the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submissions 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	
---	--	---	--

