

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9815 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-116 Year-2025 Thana- RISIYAP District- Aurangabad

Krishna Singh Son of Late Mohan Singh R/o Village - Bumru, P.S. - Risiap,
Dist. - Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms.Mukul Kumari

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nand Kishore Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 30-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Risiap PS Case No. 116 of 2025 registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 117(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 petitioner in an intoxicated condition came and started
abusing his brother near a temple where he was sitting on 19-
10-2025 at 7 pm, on the pretext that his brother got his wife's
name struck off the roll of Jeevika, thus an amount of Rs.
10,000/- did not come in her account, further petitioner's son
came with rod and petitioner took the rod from his son and



assaulted his brother on head causing injury.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant on account of dispute as alleged in the FIR. It is next submitted that no doubt specific allegation of assault is alleged against the petitioner but then the blow is not alleged to have been repeated.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that there is a specific allegation against the petitioner of assaulting the brother of the informant by rod on head, i.e., vital part of the body and the injury has been opined to be grievous.

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	
---	--	---	--

