

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78634 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-70 Year-2025 Thana- Araria Sangram District- Madhubani

1. Md. Wazir Rain @ Md. Wazir S/o Md. Rasul Rain @ Rasul Vakhsha R/o vill - Sangram, P.S.- Araria Sangram, Distt.- Madhubani
2. Md. Saukat Rain S/o Md. Rasul Rain @ Rasul Vakhsha R/o vill - Sangram, P.S.- Araria Sangram, Distt.- Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Baleshwar Kamat

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Uma Shankar Prasad Singh

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      03-12-2025                      1.    Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2.    The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Sangram PS Case No. 70 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 125(2), 115(2), 116(1), 303(2), 109, 352, 351(2), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3.    Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on 6-9-2025, his son Md. Abu Kamar was coming when he reached near NH-57, four named accused persons including the petitioners intercepted him and started abusing, on objection, Md. Wazir Rain (petitioner no.1) gave orders to kill,



on which accused Saukat (petitioner no.2) assaulted him by knife causing injury below his left eye and thereafter other accused assaulted, on alarm informant reached the place of occurrence, when the accused assaulted him also and Md Sarfaraz snatched Rs. 35,000/-.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that petitioner no.1 is alleged to be an order giver while against the petitioner no.2 it is alleged that he assaulted the injured by knife causing injury below his left eye, but then the injury has been opined to be simple in nature.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that allegation is of assaulting the injured by knife by petitioner no.2, it is next submitted that no doubt the injury has been opined to be simple, but then knife is a dangerous weapon and injury caused is on vital part of the body, it is also submitted that no doubt petitioner no.1 is not alleged to have assaulted, but his presence at the place of occurrence emboldened the petitioner no.2 to commit the occurrence.

6. Considering the submission made by learned APP,



the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

