

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67208 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-138 Year-2025 Thana- JITNA District- East Champaran

1. Ujjawal Singh @ Anku son of Lalan Singh Resident of Village - Pipra, P.S. - Jitna, District - East Champaran
2. Lalan Singh son of Late Ramanand Singh Resident of Village - Pipra, P.S. - Jitna, District - East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Madhurendra Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Md. Ataur Rahman

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 08-12-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Jitna PS Case No. 138 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 110, 118(1), 303(2), 351(2), 352 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that petitioner No. 1 (Ujjawal Singh) and co-accused Aditya Kumar Singh assaulted the informant and snatched gold locket, further when son of the informant, Mantosh Kumar, intervened, then petitioner No. 2 and co-accused Aditya Kumar



Singh assaulted him and snatched his gold locket and cash of Rs. 1,000/-, further on instigation of petitioner no. 2, petitioner no. 1 assaulted the informant by means of knife as a result of which he received injuries on his head.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the FIR initially was instituted under sections which carries punishment of seven years and less but then during the course of supervision, Section 109 BNS was added, as such petitioners were not given notice under Section 35 BNSS. It is next submitted that on account of a trivial dispute relating to irrigating the field, the occurrence is alleged to have taken place.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that allegation is of assaulting the informant by knife by petitioner No. 1 on orders of petitioner no. 2. It is next submitted that though injury suffered has been opined to be simple but then it is on the parietal region, which is a vital part of the body and knife is a dangerous weapon. It is further submitted that though petitioner no. 2 is not alleged to have assaulted, but then his presence at the place of occurrence embolden the petitioner no. 1 to commit the occurrence.

6. Considering the submission made by learned APP,



the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

