

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.79239 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-196 Year-2025 Thana- RANIGANJ District- Araria

=====

Dabesh Kumar @ Dewesh Kumar @ Deepak Kumar Gupta S/O Jay Prakash
Yadav @ Ghughru Yadav R/O Village- Belsara Ward No.07, P.S- Raniganj,
Distt.- Araria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mukesh Kumar Rana, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rajendra Singh, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 28-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Raniganj P.S. Case No. 196 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109, 3(5) of the B.N.S and section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per prosecution case, on 25.05.2025 at about 15:30 hours, the petitioner along with co-accused persons is said to have started fighting with the informant's children over plucking mangoes. When the children raised an alarm, the informant and her husband came to save them, the accused persons assaulted them too. The petitioner fired at the informant's husband with intention to kill him, causing a firearm injury below his right eye.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are innocent and have committed no offence as



alleged in the FIR. It is further submitted that both the parties are *gotia* (co-sharer) and due to the partition of the property the present occurrence taken place. Petitioner bears no criminal antecedent.

5. The learned A.P.P. for the State opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that it is evident from the perusal of the F.I.R. and impugned order that there is specific allegation against the petitioner, who is said to have fired at the informant's husband causing a firearm injury below his right eye, coupled with the description of seizure list as mentioned in the impugned order. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, petitioner is said to have fired a weapon upon the informant's husband as well as material available on record, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

Nilmani/-

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

