

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9135 of 2026**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-471 Year-2022 Thana- PAROO District- Muzaffarpur

Mukesh Sahani S/O Babulal Sahani R/O Village- Basantpur, P.S- Paroo,  
Distt.- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Prasoon Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Damodar Prasad Tiwary

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

2      10-02-2026                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and  
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his  
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under  
Sections 341, 323, 147, 148, 149, 302, 304, 120B, 504 and 506  
of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 25(1-B)a, 26 and 27 of  
the Arms Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that  
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the  
informant alleges that two dead bodies were recovered and the  
same was identified as that of Pankaj and Bhutkun. Further  
body of Pankaj had firearm injury and a pistol was lying near  
the two dead bodies. It is next alleged that he came to know that  
Pankaj, Bhutkun along with Ranjit were returning home after a



liquor party, when on the way there was an altercation amongst the three and Bhutkun with his pistol shot Pankaj dead and in the meantime, nearby people gathered along with petitioner who shot Bhutkun to dead.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant, who is a Chaukidar, alleges that two dead bodies were found lying at the place of occurrence and he came to know later that Pankaj, Bhutkun along with Ranjit were returning after a liquor party and on account of an altercation amongst them, Bhutkun shot Pankaj thereafter people gathered and they along with Ranjit assaulted Bhutkun to death. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence nor he has disclosed that who saw the occurrence or the petitioner assaulting Bhutkun. It is next submitted that the entire allegation hinges around suspicion and even presuming what has been alleged is true without admitting, then it is not the case of the prosecution that it was only petitioner who along with Ranjit assaulted Bhutkun to death as it has been alleged that nearby people gathered who assaulted Bhutkun. It is thus reiterated and



submitted that when informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence, as such, the entire allegation hinges around suspicion when petitioner admittedly is a person with clean antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks, is directed to be released on bail on his furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Paroo P. S. Case No.471 of 2022, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.

7. The application stands allowed.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

vikash/-

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

