

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74352 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-14 Year-2025 Thana- SHERGHATI District- Gaya

Md. Saklain Alam @ chotu Son of Md Jahoor R/o Jama Masjid, Balumath,
P.O. and P.S. - Balumath, District - Latehar, Jharkhand - 829202.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Arun Kumar Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Abhay Kumar Roy

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 18-11-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner through
virtual mode and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in Sherghati P. S. Case No.14 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Explosive
Substances Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the
informant alleges that he received an information about a bomb
blast and accordingly, reached the place of occurrence and
found that a blast was carried out in the clinic of Dr. Tapeswar
Prasad. Further, the occurrence was committed by Danish, Md.
Sohail and Chhotu (petitioner). Further, after the occurrence
Md. Sohail had concealed the remaining bomb in the house of



his uncle Jumman Mistry with his consent. It is next alleged that two children also got injured while they were playing on the terrace of Jumman Mistry as the bomb blasted. In the occurrence, son of Jumman Mistry was also injured. Further, spy informed that the accused persons had assembled in the house of Jumman Mistry and the planning to carry out blast was made about 1-2 days back. Further, accused had planned blast at different places also. It is next alleged that from the house of Jumman Mistry several articles for preparing bomb was recovered. Thereafter, house of Md. Iqbal and Md. Sohail was also raided but they were found absconding.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant based on general and omnibus allegation. It is submitted that the Fir does not even remotely disclose that on what basis the informant came to know that the accused persons including the petitioner were involved in the occurrence. It is next submitted that Dr. Tapeswar Prasad had also instituted Sherghati P. S. Case No.12 of 2025, wherein he alleged that on 06.01.2025 at 7.50, a call came on the mobile of his Compounder informing that on his clinic a bomb has blasted, as such, he can come. Accordingly, he reached the place of



occurrence where police and administration were present from before and also came to know that on 04.01.2025 firing was also resorted to.

5. On query of the Court that how the name of the petitioner transpired, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner fairly submitted that during course of the investigation, Jumman Mistry was apprehended and he disclosed the name of the petitioner.

6. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that allegation as alleged in the FIR are serious and required investigation and name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of Jumman Mistry in whose house the remaining bomb had blasted causing injury to two children.

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

8. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

