

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.75596 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-196 Year-2025 Thana- GHORASAHAN District- East
Champaran

=====

Mohan Rai @ Mohan Kumar Yadav son of Kedar Rai Resident of Village-
Barwa Kachariya Tola PS- Ghorasahan Distt -East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Gyan Prakash, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Suman Kumari Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 17-12-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Ghorasahan PS Case No. 196 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1),
109(1), 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of two cases and the informant alleges
that petitioner assaulted Mubarak by knife causing injury on
hand.

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 perusal of the injury



report, it would manifest that the same records that the injury has been caused on hand by hard and blunt substance. It is thus submitted that allegation of assaulting Mubarak by knife gets belied by the injury report. It is next submitted that informant had booked the Scorpio vehicle of the petitioner and on account of dispute relating to fare, an altercation took place in which both sides assaulted each other.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that there is a specific allegation against this petitioner of assaulting Mubarak by knife, but then the injury report records that the injury has been caused by hard and blunt substance and the doctor has reserved the opinion with regard to the injury which amply demonstrates that injury is not simple, it is also submitted that though it is being submitted that informant had booked the Scorpio vehicle of the petitioner and on account of dispute relating to fare, the occurrence is alleged to have taken place, but then from perusal of the pleadings made in the anticipatory bail application, it would manifest that except for a bald pleading no documentary evidence has been brought on record to even remotely suggest that the Scorpio vehicle belongs to the petitioner or his family members nor it records that for which



place the informant had booked the vehicle, which amply demonstrates that a false plea has been taken to seek anticipatory bail, it is further submitted that petitioner has antecedent of two cases and in the event if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

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	
---	--	---	--

