

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64009 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-215 Year-2025 Thana- PAROO District- Muzaffarpur

=====

Guddu Kumar Son of Subhamdeo Ram Resident of village -Kamalपुरa
Mathiya, P.S. - Paroo, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Surendra Kumar Singh, Adv

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Mohammad Sufyan, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 24-09-2025 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 126(2),
115(2), 109, 303(2), 3(5) and 352 of the Bharatiya Nyaya
Sanhita and Section 27 of Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case and allegation is of
committing robbery at gun point and of firing and petitioner was
identified by the informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submit that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the
informant for the reason that he is having friendship with a girl,
who is related/known to the informant. It is next submitted that



the date of occurrence is of 25-4-2025 and the FIR was instituted on 27-4-2025 and the same was sent to the court of learned CJM on 6-5-2025, i.e., after a delay of nine days without any plausible explanation, which casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution. It is further submitted that informant is mere technician at JIO etc Tower, but then informant alleges that on the date of occurrence, he was intercepted by the accused persons including the petitioner and they looted him of 4 ATM card of different banks, Aadhar card along with Rs. 47,000/- in cash. It is also submitted that it does not appear probable that a technician would carry four ATM cards. It is submitted that informant in the FIR also alleges that he identified the petitioner, but then it is submitted that if petitioner was known to the informant whether he would have indulged in such an occurrence which amply demonstrates that for ulterior reasons the petitioner has been implicated only to ensure that he stays away with the girl with whom he is in relationship. It is further submitted that during course of investigation at para-31 of the case-diary, it has come that petitioner is having friendship with a girl, who is known to the informant. It is reiterated and submitted that the delay in instituting and sending the FIR to the learned district court also casts an aspersion. It is also submitted



that petitioner is a student of history and is pursuing his graduation from Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar Bihar University. It is next submitted that if petitioner is sent to judicial custody, his entire career would get jeopardized and chances are bright that he may come in contact with hardened criminals.

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, 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. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten 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 Paru P.S. Case No. 215 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

