

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64214 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-224 Year-2025 Thana- RAJGIR District- Nalanda

Rohit Kumar Son of Sudhanshu Mistri R/o Vill - Bajar Road, Ward No. - 04,
Bangali Pada, P.S. - Rajgir, District - Nalanda, State - Bihar - 803116.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kuldeep Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umesh Lal Verma, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 24-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Rajgir P.S. Case No. 224 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109(1) and
3(5) of the BNS as well as Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges
that four accused persons on 28.04.2025, at 10:30 AM came and
asked his name, further, on coming to know the name of the
informant, the accused started assaulting him and one accused
who had a lock on his head (Shikha) fired, thereafter, an accused
wearing a cap also fired when people on hearing the sound of
firing came to save the informant and the accused fled away, it



is further alleged that reason for the occurrence was that on 27.04.2025, two accused on a motorcycle were driving on a newly constructed road which was objected by the informant which had led to a fight.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that FIR was against unknown and the petitioner came to be implicated based on confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value in the eyes of law. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would transpire that allegation of assault is also not specific, though with regard to firing the informant has described the culprit.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that earlier Shailendra Kumar @ Rider had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Criminal Miscellaneous No. 58938 of 2025 and the same came to be rejected by an order dated 10.09.2025. It is next submitted that while rejecting the anticipatory bail application of Shailendra Kumar @ Rider, it was recorded at Para-5 that the occurrence was captured in the CCTV and in the instant anticipatory bail application, there is no pleading to even remotely suggest that petitioner was not



present at the place of occurrence and investigation of the case is in its nascent stages and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

