

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.79723 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-177 Year-2025 Thana- MAKER District- Saran

=====

Ganesh Sahni @ Ganes Sahni @ Ganesh Sahani S/O Jai Narayan Sahni
Resident of Village- Dihi Siroman, Badhi Chak (Dihi Pirmaker), P.S- Maker,
District- Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Dr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, Adv

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Bhanu Pratap Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 08-12-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Maker PS Case No. 177 of 2025, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109, 352,
351(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges
that he was intercepted by the accused persons and Rahul
assaulted him by knife causing injury on head and Rahul along
with Ganesh (petitioner) assaulted maternal grandson of his
brother aged about 4 years by brick causing injury on head.

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 allegation of assaulting the informant by knife is against Rahul. It is further submitted that during the course of investigation, it transpired that wife of the informant used to talk to Rahul, as such the occurrence is alleged to have taken place and petitioner, being uncle of Rahul, came to be implicated.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that though petitioner is not alleged to have assaulted the informant by knife, but then it is alleged that he was also present at the place of occurrence and along with Rahul assaulted the four years maternal grandson of the brother of the informant by brick causing injury on head, it is thus submitted that it is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

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	
---	--	---	--

