

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.233 of 2026**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-496 Year-2025 Thana- DHANARUA District- Patna

- 
1. Rajmohan @ Rajmohan Prasad S/O Late Subalal Prasad R/O Village- Pabhera, P.S.- Dhanrua, Dist.- Patna
  2. Sunny Yadav @ Anup Kumar S/O Rajmohan R/O Village- Pabhera, P.S.- Dhanrua, Dist.- Patna

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sunaina Devi W/O Chaitunath Sapera R/O Village- Pabhera, P.S.- Dhanrua, Dist.- Patna

... .. Respondent/s

---

**Appearance :**

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Sikandar  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sadanand Paswan

---

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

2      17-06-2026                      1.      Heard the learned counsel for the appellants and  
the learned Special Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The appellants have challenged the order dated 22.12.2025 passed by the learned Special Judge SC/ST Act, Patna Sadar in connection with ABP No. 5014 of 2025 arising out of Dhanrua PS Case No. 496 of 2025, instituted for the offences under Sections 103(1) and 3(5) of the B.N.S and Section 3(2)(V) of the Scheduled Castes & Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act and Section 27 of the Arms Act, whereby their prayer for grant of anticipatory bail has been rejected.



3. The learned counsel for the appellants submits that appellants are persons with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that Rajmohan, Sunny and Bhusan intercepted her and her husband and Sunny fired on account of which, her husband got injured and thereafter he was admitted in a hospital from where he was referred to P.M.C.H where he died during the course of treatment on 11.08.2025.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that specific allegation of firing at the husband of the informant is against Sunny. It is next submitted Rajmohan is father of Sunny. It is also submitted that it does not appear probable that father and son together would have committed the occurrence.

5. The learned Special PP opposes the appeal and submits that wife had instituted the instant case alleging that her husband was killed by Sunny and appellant no.1 along with Bhusan were also present at the place of occurrence. It is submitted that it does not appear probable that a wife would falsely try to implicate someone who was not involved in the killing of her husband. It is also submitted that no doubt, specific allegation of firing is against Sunny, but then presence



of Rajmohan and Bhusan at the place of occurrence emboldened him to commit the occurrence of firing leading to death of the husband of the informant.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the appellants.

7. The prayer of the appellants for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

vikash/-

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

