

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.71028 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-371 Year-2024 Thana- AMNAUR District- Saran

Rajneesh Kumar son of Bhuneshwar Rai Resident of Village- Piparpati, Ps-
Marhowrah, Dist- Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Avinash Raj, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mritunjay Kumar Nirala, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 04-11-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Amnour P.S. Case No. 371 of 2024 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 313 and 61(2) of the BNS,
2023 read with Sections 25(1-B) (b), 25(1-B) (a), 26 and 35 of
the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that he received an information that three accused
persons were sitting near a *Pulia* in a suspicious condition,
accordingly informant along with the police force reached the
place of occurrence and apprehended Shantanu, Munna and
Vishal, further from Shantanu and Vishal, one live cartridge



each was recovered while from Munna a knife was recovered and they disclosed that cartridges and knife were given by the petitioner who had asked them to wait as he was coming with more cartridges and gun.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case based on confessional statement of apprehended accused in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value. It is next submitted that petitioner was not even present at the place of occurrence. It is further submitted that the accused who were apprehended and seizure list which was prepared was not signed by any independent witnesses and the videography of the occurrence was also not done.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that no doubt petitioner was not apprehended from the place of occurrence, but then it is alleged that three accused persons were apprehended with cartridges and knife and it was they who disclosed the name of the petitioner that he had provided the cartridges and knife to them and had asked them to wait, it is next submitted that though no specific pleading has been made in the anticipatory bail application alleging that the occurrence



was not videographed, but even if the same was not videographed that is a breach which shall be looked into by the superior officials. The learned APP further submits that from perusal of the pleadings made in the anticipatory bail application, it would manifest that the same does not even remotely suggest that what the petitioner does i.e. whether he is a student or works somewhere etc. It is next submitted that investigation in the case is continuing and if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

