

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63866 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-9 Year-2025 Thana- PALI District- Jehanabad

Rahul Kumar son of Bijendra Yadav R/o - Bhadsara Tad, P.S - Pali, District -
Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Rabi Bhushan Prasad
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Nirmal Kumar Sinha
	Mr. Sunil Kumar, Adv

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 23-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Pali P.S. Case No. 9 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 352, 109(1), 303(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that he was going to Mahadevpur and when he reached near the house of Shivram, the accused persons intercepted him and co-accused Rahul stabbed him in abdomen, thereafter petitioner assaulted him by an iron rod causing injury and



snatched Rs. 10,000/- while Bijendra snatched his chain.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that specific allegation of stabbing is against Rahul though petitioner is alleged to have assaulted the informant by an iron rod causing injury, but then from perusal of the injury report, it would manifest that the injured suffered only one injury not caused by iron rod, which amply demonstrates the false implication of the petitioner.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the anticipatory bail application. It is submitted that what is not disputed rather stands admitted is that informant was stabbed on his vital part of the body by Rahul; and the petitioner was also present at the place of occurrence and the presence of the petitioner along with other accused persons emboldened Rahul to commit the occurrence. It is also submitted that investigation in the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submission made by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not



inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

