

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.83228 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-272 Year-2025 Thana- KALYANPUR District- East Champaran

Raushan Singh Son of Bhim Sharma Singh @ Bhim Singh Resident of
Village - Sishwa Narshing @ Narshing, P.S. - Kalyanpur, District - East
Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sujeet Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Md. Anzarul Haque Sahara, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 17-12-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Kalyanpur P.S. Case No. 272 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3), 127(2), 115(1), 118(2), 109, 324(5), 308(2), 61(2), 303(2), 351(2), 352, and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. Allegedly, while the informant was sitting in his Bathan, in the meantime, the petitioner along with others came there and started abusing and assaulting him. It is specifically alleged that this petitioner entered into the room of the informant and took out his licensee gun and assaulted the informant with the Butt, due to which he sustained injury near his eye. On the second assault, the teeth of the informant were



also broken. The other accused persons also assaulted the informant and snatched the valuables, besides the allegation of damaging the licensee gun. It is further alleged that the accused persons, including the petitioner, were demanding extortion money, and they have also assaulted the son of the informant, due to which he sustained two grievous injuries.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submitted that in fact the name of the petitioner has been implicated on account of the previous enmity, as earlier also the informant had instituted Kalyanpur P.S. Case No. 140 of 2016, and since then the parties are on inimical term. The false implication of the petitioner cannot be ruled out, as the occurrence took place on 02.07.2025 and on the same day itself police personnel reached at the place of occurrence, but surprisingly the F.I.R. came to be instituted on 07.07.2025. It is further contended that the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner was rejected by the court below only on account of his criminal antecedent, as has been disclosed in para.3 of the application.

5. On the other hand, learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the bail application and submits that besides the multiple criminal antecedents, the petitioner has assaulted the informant and his son, due to which both of them



have sustained serious injury.

6. Regard being had to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and considering the specific accusation of causing assault to the informant and his son, leading to two grievous injuries upon the son of the informant, besides the five criminal antecedents, as has been disclosed in para. 3 of the bail application, this Court is not acceded to the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the same stands rejected.

(Harish Kumar, J)

uday/-

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

