

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69902 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-102 Year-2025 Thana- BHELDI District- Saran

=====

Muskan Ansari @ Shawanawaj Hussain @ Muskan @ Shahanawaj hussain
S/o Najir @ Najir Hussain R/o Village - Rai Sirsa, P.S - Bheldi, District -
Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dhananjay Kumar Tiwary, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 13-10-2025 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 303(2),
126(2), 109 and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges
that while he was returning from a birthday party on
17.04.2025, at about 01:30 a.m., he was intercepted by 4-5
unknown criminals and they fired twice and one bullet hit his
thigh and thereafter accused persons took his chain and cash of
Rs.25,000/-. Further, one accused was identified as Muskan
Ansari (petitioner) and claims that he can identify the other
accused persons also.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that it does not appear probable that informant at 01:30 a.m. in the night while returning from the birthday party would have been carrying Rs.25,000/-. It is next submitted that petitioner was also an invitee in the said birthday party, as such, it does not appear probable that petitioner would have participated in the occurrence as the informant was known to him.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that since petitioner was known to the informant, as such, for the present, it does not appear probable that petitioner would have been falsely implicated in the instant case. It is further submitted that it is an admitted fact that informant was shot and investigation in the case is continuing and petitioner has criminal antecedent and if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond or tamper with the evidence.

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 in connection with



Bheldi P.S. Case No. 102 of 2025 pending in the Court of
learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Saran/Successor Court.

7. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

