

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.72984 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-152 Year-2025 Thana- GAURICHAK District- Patna

=====

Ranjan Kumar S/o Hare Krishna @ Har Kishan @ Har Kishan Rai R/o
Village - Jamalpur, P.S - Gaurichak, District – Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Binod Murari Mishra
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 13-11-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State, Sri Rabindra Kumar.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in
connection with Bheja P.S. Case No. 82 of 2025, registered
for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2),
352, 351(2), 351(3), 109, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya
Sanhita and 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 he, for the last 8-9 years, is living in his
matrimonial house (sasural) and does not have a brother-in-
law and is in possession of 4 bigha of land, on account of



which name accused persons abused him on 26-3-2025, while he was coming from a hospital with his child. It is also alleged that petitioner fired causing fire-arm injury on his left knee.

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 tenor of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that on account of dispute relating to property, the occurrence is alleged to have taken place. It is also submitted that a title suit in between the parties is also pending adjudication.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State, Sri Rabindra Kumar, opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that there is a specific allegation against the petitioner of causing fire-arm injury to the informant on knee and the injury has been opined to be grievous, it is also submitted that even if any property dispute is existing in between the parties that in itself is not a justification for causing fire arm injury.

6. Considering the submission made by learned APP, 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	
---	--	---	--

